

A N
APOLOGY
FOR
Congregational Divines :

Against the charge of,

1. *Caspianism*, or *Antinomianism*.
2. Countenancing Incompetent Tradesmen, as Preachers.
3. Causeless Separation from the Publick Worship.

Under which Head are Published Amicable Letters between the Author and a Conformist (a Man of Renown, known elsewhere to be such) about Liturgies and Ceremonies.

By a **PRESBYTERIAN.**

Also a Speech delivered at *Turners-Hall*, April 29. Where Mr. *Keith*, a Reformed Quaker, with the leave of the Lord Mayor and Bishop, required Mr. *Penn*, Mr. *Elwood*, &c. To appear to Answer his Charge against them.

By **Trepidantium Malleus.**

With an Account of his being knockt down, and a Stone slung at his Head till the Blood run down his Cloaths, after a threat about Ten Days before, from Friend, J. F. openly in the Coffee-House, That a Church Friend of theirs, You'd be would do it,

Jud XIX. 30. Consider of it, take advise and speak your Minds.

London, Printed for John Harris, at the

APOLLO

F.C.P.

CONSTITUTION

OF THE

UNITED STATES

OF AMERICA

ARTICLE I

SECTION 1

All legislative Powers herein granted shall be vested in a Congress of the United States, which shall consist of a Senate and House of Representatives.

SECTION 2

The House of Representatives shall be composed of Members chosen every second Year by the People of the several States, and the Electors in each State shall have the Qualifications requisite for Electors in that State.

SECTION 3

The Senate of the United States shall be composed of two Senators from each State, chosen by the Legislature thereof, for six Years; and each Senator shall have the Qualifications requisite for Senators in that State.

SECTION 4

The Congress shall assemble at least once in every Year, and such Meeting shall be held in the City of New York, until otherwise provided by Law.

SECTION 5

The Congress shall have the sole Power to lay and collect Taxes on Imports, Exports, and on all other Objects of Taxation, but all Taxes on Imports and Exports shall be uniform across the Union.

SECTION 6

The Congress shall have the sole Power to borrow Money on the Credit of the United States, to regulate Commerce with foreign Nations, to regulate Commerce among the several States, and to regulate Commerce with the Indian Tribes.

SECTION 7

The Congress shall have the sole Power to coin Money, to regulate the Value of the same, to fix the Standard of Weights and Measures, to provide for the Punishment of counterfeiting the Securities and current Coin of the United States.

SECTION 8

The Congress shall have the sole Power to declare War, to issue Letters of Marque and Reprisal, to grant Letters of Consue and Safe Conduct, to raise and support Armies, but no Appropriation of Money to that Use shall be for a longer Term than two Years; to raise and support a Navy, to make and regulate Rules of the Road, and of Manner of Seizure, and of Sale of the same, to make and regulate Rules of the Road, and of Manner of Seizure, and of Sale of the same.

SECTION 9

The Congress shall have the sole Power to grant Letters of Consue and Safe Conduct, to raise and support Armies, but no Appropriation of Money to that Use shall be for a longer Term than two Years; to raise and support a Navy, to make and regulate Rules of the Road, and of Manner of Seizure, and of Sale of the same.

SECTION 10

The Congress shall have the sole Power to grant Letters of Consue and Safe Conduct, to raise and support Armies, but no Appropriation of Money to that Use shall be for a longer Term than two Years; to raise and support a Navy, to make and regulate Rules of the Road, and of Manner of Seizure, and of Sale of the same.

SECTION 11

The Congress shall have the sole Power to grant Letters of Consue and Safe Conduct, to raise and support Armies, but no Appropriation of Money to that Use shall be for a longer Term than two Years; to raise and support a Navy, to make and regulate Rules of the Road, and of Manner of Seizure, and of Sale of the same.

SECTION 12

The Congress shall have the sole Power to grant Letters of Consue and Safe Conduct, to raise and support Armies, but no Appropriation of Money to that Use shall be for a longer Term than two Years; to raise and support a Navy, to make and regulate Rules of the Road, and of Manner of Seizure, and of Sale of the same.

SECTION 13

The Congress shall have the sole Power to grant Letters of Consue and Safe Conduct, to raise and support Armies, but no Appropriation of Money to that Use shall be for a longer Term than two Years; to raise and support a Navy, to make and regulate Rules of the Road, and of Manner of Seizure, and of Sale of the same.

SECTION 14

The Congress shall have the sole Power to grant Letters of Consue and Safe Conduct, to raise and support Armies, but no Appropriation of Money to that Use shall be for a longer Term than two Years; to raise and support a Navy, to make and regulate Rules of the Road, and of Manner of Seizure, and of Sale of the same.

SECTION 15

The Congress shall have the sole Power to grant Letters of Consue and Safe Conduct, to raise and support Armies, but no Appropriation of Money to that Use shall be for a longer Term than two Years; to raise and support a Navy, to make and regulate Rules of the Road, and of Manner of Seizure, and of Sale of the same.

To the Reverend and
Learned Congregational Divines
in the City of London, said to be
afflicted for the New Spring An-
tinomian abominations; and there-
fore just Censurers of the Linnen
Draper (now a Speaker) who would-
stand not the Doctrine he would
defend, and therefore is only a
Crispian Would-be, Mr. Griffith,
Mr. Mead, Mr. Crofte, Mr.
Nesbet, Mr. Taylor, Mr. Lard-
ner, Mr. Harris, and others,

Reverend Sirs,
I have been often and long char-
 ged on some of your Brethren,
 who have appear'd in a great fi-
 gure, that they were Antinom-
 ian, and those not of the best Edition,
 Crispian, but some of your Presbye-
 rian Brethren, as well as you, could
 not believe it, till: A 2 1. They

1. They saw some open Vouchers for Dr. *Crisp* his Notions, which occasion'd shame and sorrow to some of you, and Ingenious Confessions that they had betrayed your Cause: One of which is indeed an Ingenious Man, and discovers in his Writings good reading. He is a good Philologist, Philosopher, Divine, and Satyrist, and it is believed he hath made the best of a bad Cause, tho' not without many and considerable flaws. It was his unhappiness, more than his Antagonists, to charge him with a *Bombastick Style*. This I knew not, being a Stranger in *London* till very lately.

2. Till they saw others open Abettors and Fautors of an *Impudent, Ignorant, Corrupt, Impertinent*. The following Account will prove this, to be his true Character.

I think it Sirs, proper to begin with a short, very short, Scheme of Dr. *Crisp* his Doctrine, which I had about Six Months since occasion to look into, being charged by his Son (in a friendly Letter I confess) with wronging his Father in my *Judicial Anti-Baxterian*, and also being often told by others that I was mistaken, not only

in the Dr's sence, but Iphrases too.
 This gave me the Curiosity of a fur-
 ther inquiry, with a resolution to Ac-
 knowledge my mistakes, if any such.
 But I found much worse then I expe-
 cted, or then I knew others had ta-
 ken notice of. I sent for his Son
 (whom I yet value) desiring him to
 come to my Lodgings, or to appoint
 me a time when I might wait on him.
 He refused, passing, as I hear, a Com-
 pliment upon me, I was a ready Man,
 &c. This seem'd to me, to argue guilt.
 The Scheme is this. " That God
 " Loveth the elect with a Comple-
 " mental Love, in the State of uncre-
 " genecy, when in the height of all
 " their Wickedness, Whoredoms,
 " Murders, Thefts, and that, he
 " hath no more to lay to their
 " charge then to the charge of any
 " Saint in Heaven. — That they are
 " not the Sinners, but Christ was the
 " Sinner. — That when Christ said,
 " My God, my God, why hast thou for-
 " saken me; He was separate from
 " God, and odious to him as a Toad
 " to a Man, and so continued till he
 " Rose from the Dead, and then was
 " there a kind of renewing the Son-
 " ship.

ship. — That not only the guilt
 of our Sins, and Obligation to
 punishment, lay on Christ, but the
 Loathsomeness, Abominableness, and
 Pollution of Sin itself, till he
 breath'd it out. And thus as the stain
 of sin it self was on him, so he bore
 all the sadness due for Sin, and that
 whoever hath any sadness for Sin
 is out of Christ, the way: And
 therefore Paul did not speak of
 himself, but only personated a fer-
 vourous Man, when he said, *Rom.*
7. 24. O wretched Man that I am,
who shall deliver me from this Body
of Death? — That Faith is an Ex-
 ercise of the Soul, Answering the Call,
 I come — without any change in
 Man. That Paul's Justification, *Rom.*
5. 1. Or Was not a Justification
 before God, but in the Heart and
 Conscience of Man: That Justifi-
 cation cannot be known or eviden-
 ced by sanctification, altho Paul
 saith, *Blessed is the Man so about the*
Lord imputeth Righteousness without
works. God justified the Heathen by
 Faith, &c.

I. Not by Universal obedience
 (and here he most unphilosophi-
 cally

“ rally attempts to prove, that no
 “ such thing can be, and that this
 “ would infer perfect obedience.)

“ 1. Not by Love to the Brethren,
 “ 2. And therefore it is a Dispa-
 “ ragement to the Spirit, to be tryed
 “ by the word.

But no end is there of Naming the
 black, horrid, and blasphemous Noti-
 ons and Expressions in that Book :
 Which I have not ty me, and there-
 fore it cannot be expected I should
 Cite Chapter and Page, yet I chal-
 lunge any of his Advocates to charge
 me with mis-representing him. I will
 not boast how exactly, I have kept as
 to sense, so words : Tho when I saw
 this Book last, I little thought to have
 this occasion to appear against it, for
 which, now this among other things
 shall be my Apology, It was reported
 I was gotten to the height of *Crispia-
 nism*, by I suppose those who would
 have it to be so, who also say, every
 Lecturer at *Pimms Hall* are theirs.
 It is high time such be undeceiv'd a-
 bout me, and some of them.

But some of the Drs. *Creatures*, or
Friends, or *Well-wishers*, or however
 we phrase it, thus plead for him.

A. 4.

That

That tho they will not justify the Dr. his hard phraſes, yet will his miſtaken Notions. That the Famous *Witchius* (the *Duch Divine* in a *Latin Tract*) that, that truly great Man, Mr. *Hew*, and that honeſt *Dr. Bacon* ly and others, charge not the Dr. ſo high as many others do.

To all which I Answer, *ſay*

1. Are hard dangerous Expreſſions nothing, if your Plea were not a miſtake? Which by no means muſt be granted you.

What if at a ſoll Table, All the Diſhes there, were accounted good, and wholeſom, only of one Diſh ſome ſaid, The Meat was very unſafe; dangerous, unwholeſom, others ſaid no: All was good, and ſafe. Only they granted, with all the Company, the ſawce was very bad, and ſuch, as ſome ſaid, the Meat was, would not a wiſe Man, eſpecially if weak and ſickly, leave that one ſuſpected Diſh, and Eat of the unexceptionable good ones? What need we meddle (ſay I) with this, at leaſt ſuſpicious book, (but others know to be worſe then *Heterodox*) when we have ſuch excellent Tracts, done by Men of great Learning,

ning, and Men very Orthodox, all whose Doctrine is Acknowledged to be true, and their Expressions safe. Own, say I, such Tracts and let *This* go shift for it self.

2. *Witchius* chargeth him high, if not so high as others. And some wise Men at home, think that Learned Forreigner understood not our Controversies here when all is done.

3. As for Mr. *How*, and others with him, I can truly say, that I ever thought it (as did many Congregational, as well as Presbyterian Divines) to be at least an unjustifiable practice, to hang out such a Sign to Dr. *Crisp* his Book. Which no doubt decoyed not a few, as if they approv'd the Doctrine therein contain'd. And tho' that great Man in his subtil defence of himself, was pleas'd to ask Mr. *Baxter*, whether if Dr. *C.* were now alive? He would have him silenced for his Errors, &c. I know not what was Mr. *Baxters* mind in this thing, seeing he was not pleas'd to tell us, but this I doubt not to say, The Dr. deserv'd it, and that I could not censure him who had Power to do it, thus to do.

A 5.

4. That.

4. That Dr. *Beverly* might mean honestly, tho mistaken in this, as in other things. How weak! Good Man, are his Attempts, to Reconcile Mr. *Baxter* and Dr. *Crisp* together, every one that hath half an Eye may see. Mr. *Baxter*, saith, he, was a Son of Thunder, Dr. *Crisp* of Consolation, and God gives various gifts for the benefit of the Church, &c. I aver the two Poles in the Heavens, may as soon meet together as these two harmonize. Can these two be reconcil'd? One that says, Faith is put by a Synecdoche for all other Graces, and is all one with Gospel obedience; and therefore Man is justified before God by Faith, and works. And he that says, Man is justified before God, not by works nor Faith neither.

If Mr. *Baxters* Doctrine be as the Itch, I have often said, Dr. *Crisp* his Doctrine is as the Plague. I confess Dr. *Beverlys* Essays, to reconcile the Reverend Mr. *Williams*, and Dr. *Crisp* together, looks with a little better hue and dress. Yet his distinctions of our Sins on Christ, by way of *imputation* and *attribution*. Nor his discovery of that place of Scripture, where Christ is said to Come the second time without.

without Sin unto salvation. As if he came with Sin in his first coming, in my apprehension, are not satisfactory, especially when so many good sound senses may be put on these last words. By the way, I doubt not but this (otherwise famous and worthy Divine) will be found to be a false Prophet, whether he be a false Expositor or no. I with him prepar'd for such a storm as Monsieur Jerue, after his magnifying the Apocalyptical Mead, and the expiration of his two Years, met with. Where is that Prophet? The Dauphin Prophet? (I will not say Bp. Usher's Prophecies) Gildas Sapiens, our first Pious, Wise, British Writer, saith thus of the Old Britains: That they were most superstitiously given to Prophecies. Cannot so many Thousands of mistaken Prophets cure us? I shall be shorter in Answering other Pleas made for Dr. Crisp.

Others plead, That in some places, the Dr. doth own that Justification is evidenced by Sanctification.

I know he doth in one Sermon, and much more stiffly deny it in another, and yet these contradictory discourses

courses must be bound up together.

Yet I ask, If the Dr. were inconsistent

1. If the Dr. were inconsistent with himself, who can help it?

2. Were not those Sermons, wherein he owns this Office of Sanctification Preacht long before the Dr. came to the highest flight of his extravagant sick brain'd Notions?

3. Were they not put in here to alay the harshness of other corrupt discourses, and as a Decoy?

Others plead for the Doctor,

How can we tell whether such words were the Doctors or no?

Those Printed Papers were only imperfect Notes taken from him.

Answer, it would be good News to us, to hear it well prov'd, that none of the Book was his; and the whole a meer sham. In short, we therefore

Condemn the Book. We object here; and secure you the Man as well as you can. But this will be a shrode Objection, if not against others, yet against his Son (said to be Honest and Conscientious, his Poysoned with his Fathers Doctrine when searcht) who Publishes the Book. Others plead,

4. Some

4. Some great Men in particular, Dr. Twisse, magnified Dr. Crisp against his Depreciatours, as a Man whose Heart was much warmed with the Grace of God, tho he was an unlearned Man, he confessed, and others say, he wanted Logick and therefore exprest not himself, as it could be wish. To all which I Answer.

1. I with his Heart had been more warmed with the free Grace of God in Christ, and with the Commands of God and Christ too. *Is Christ divided?* Tell me no more of a Christ the Saviour, without Christ the Lord, then of Christ the Lord without Christ the Saviour. Or of a Faith without Repentance, then of a Repentance without Faith. What have these Ears of mine heard from some Men? *Repentance is Faile,* &c. Then the Apostle made a distinction, where is no difference. He gives us, *Act. 20. 21.* A Compendium of his Doctrine to Jews and Greeks (which by a Synecdoche he puts for all Gentiles, *Testifying* (εὐαγγελίζωνται), which Beza renders, *Etiā atq; etiā testificans.*) Repentance towards God, and Faith towards our Lord Jesus Christ. The Foundation

dation must be digg'd low, if the superstructure be rais'd high : Faith without Repentance will as surely be found to be Presumption, as ever was a Repentance without Faith prov'd to be Desperation. God wounds and then heals. Wine (an absterlive cleansing thing) as well as Oyl (a comfortable thing) were poured in the *Samaritans* wounds. The Law knows no Repentance : As it doth not for Murther or Theft, in our Courts of Judicature. These Men take all fears to be unbelief, tho never so necessary. Did *Paul* indeed, *Rom. 7. 28.* Personate a *Scrupulous Man*, as *Dr. Crisp* says? In other words, did he indeed mock at them, who were in such a frame? When I think, *Paul* never appear'd more Lovely in the Eyes of a Holy God, and all experimental mortified self knowing Christians, then when in that Glorious (because humble) array.

This Passage drops not from the *Dr.* unadvisedly, but considerately : Not by the by, but on his great design, That all *Sadness* due for Sin, was on *Christ*, and he that had any *Sadness* for Sin was out of *Christ* the way. This wicked.

wicked Passage kindled my Zeal against him. Put this in practice, and such can never know God, or their own Hearts, and consequently this their Heresie must be damnable. I more fully Answer.

1. Whether Dr. Twisse, at that time knew Dr. Crisp, as well as we now, may be queried, or whether he indeed gave this good Character of him, is more then all of us can prove. But for the other part of his description, *his want of Learning*, and others (I know) *his want of Logic*, I never doubted it; Therefore it is the more to be wondered, that such a Blunderer should be such a Blusterer.

2. That I have heard from Good hands (and his Son yet alive knows the truth of it,) That Fifty Ministers who knew Dr. Crisp and his Doctrine, here set themselves against him. These were no *Arminians* sure, but *Calvinists*, *Baxterianism* if conceiv'd, was not then come to the Birth. Did not these Fifty Orthodox Men, break the Heart of this Doctor? However, I doubt not; This Plea or Covering is too thin, for Dr. Crisp was a Fool. For those who acknowledge his Piety, it is well observed.

serv'd by some, the Power of Grace :
That a Man should have so many
Poysonous Principles continually a-
bout him, and yet not corrupt his Vi-
rals. Whether he declin'd long be-
fore he dyed, I meddle not with, I
wonder if it were not so.

Others plead. But did not Luther
himself, and other Divines use Ex-
pressions as bad? No. He call'd
Christ indeed, *Maximus Peccatorum*,
which I will not censure, nor justify,
and be sure I never will (as I never
did) use such a phrase, tho *imputatio-
ne tantum*, he clapt to it. The worst
words I ever find Luther to use, and
wonder the Papist, that mention other
things, do not this, *Coll. Mensal*, (The
best Book bearing his Name I ever saw,
for this great Flaw) *Wise I as our Lord,
God, and should the World despise my Son,
as they do his, I would see in on Fire.* Of
vile supposition, and desperate Talk.
For what Kellsen, and other Jesuits
charge on him, that Luther should
say, *Spem vult Uxor, veniat Ancilla*, it
may be justified. If a Confessor
charge a Wife not to Lye with her
Husband, or to yeild him due Benevo-
lence, because a Protestant or Heret-
tick,

tick, (abominable) if the Wife will not Cohabit, if She will depart, for her depart, *said Paul*, I have no *Maid's Bondage*: Let the Maid be made the Wife, and Mistress, *second* The Story of *Galeacius Caracciolus*, is too well known, and the Judgment of the Divines he consulted to be mention'd here.

Others plead. Oh, Dr. *Crisp* got me out of my *Legal Spirit*, &c. had you been in that *Spirit* you call thus? If so.

Were you not got out too soon? Was not the wound skind over, that should have been more searcht and heal'd.

Hath begotten some Men that thus talk out of their *Lying Spirit*, or *Dead Spirit*? What a horrid shame is it for Men to make a Noise, I cannot sit under such a *Mans Preaching*, he is no *Gospel Minister*; And yet be found in Notorious untruths, telling Lyes, so Contradictory for a *Cristian*, and against their Accusers. I could be very particular, were it meet to talk with such pieces of Impudence, who, like Men in Bedlam, think the Spectatours to be what they themselves indeed are.

4. Some

1. Some plead. But Dr. Crisp doth
confess, That if a Man lead a vicious
Life after his Echo, &c. He is not a
believer. I know he doth thus ac-
knowledge, but yet I was greatly sur-
prised to see, ^{that he would} ^{imagine} to

2. How *family* he comes to such
Assertions, as a Man that must say so,
rather then would.

3. He knew, had he not so done,
he had past for an *Old Quosick*,
or an *Arab Rant*, and no more need
to be said.

4. Yet I pray, Let us reason toge-
ther. If Faith be such *Dr. Echo* of
the Soul, *Answering the Call*, I come
without any change in Man, and this
must not be tryed by the Word, for it is
a *disparagement* to the Spirit to be su-
try'd (the very Dregs of Quaker-
ism I am sure, - If a Man know he
hath given that Echo; I profess, I
cannot see but he may be a Debauchee
after, and be loved by God with
a Complacential Delight as before
the Echo given, and yet all well.

Now having consider'd the best or
chief Pleas I could ever hear for the
Doctor, I will ask his Advocates a
few Questions. What think you of
those that shall say :

1. That

1. That it is a comfortable thing to hear that unconverted Men may come to God as a Reconciled God? I care not to name particular Persons, for Reasons I have more than once given in some Books; but I am ready to prove, if occasion be. Others,

2. That they were never guilty of Sin, nor condemn'd by the Law: and being ask'd, Whether they never confess Sin? answer, No, when they are in a good Frame. Others, when dissuaded from worldly business on a Lord's Day, say, Christ hath kept the Sabbath for them, &c.

3. Can these find their way to Heaven? Not the old one, and if their own new one will do, as they conclude, let them not be too confident till they see the end of it. These, and such as these are the Men I would ferret out of their Holes; my Work lies not with Men a little leavened, for I question not the Piety of many call'd Antinomians, who know not the depths of Satan, nor the natural Consequence of their Opinions, tho' very corrupt.

How

How common is it in the Country for some Preachers to tell the People, Sirs, God loves you as much with a Complacential Love, when in your Whoredoms, and other Sins, as the Saints, when praying, or performing any Religious Duty? Is it indeed the Pride of Man's Heart to deny God to be the Author of Sin? must your own learned pious Brethren be ready to wring their Hands to hear such Stories proved upon Men of Reputation?

But because it is often pleaded, that God loved the Elect before Conversion with a Complacential Love; for it is impossible God should hate at one time, and love at another the same Person; if he do, he is a changeable God. And here we are often told what Dr. Tistie said about this, That Justification was an Inimicent Act in God, &c.

I shall omit what others have said about this, particularly, Mr. Williams in his Gospel Truth stated and vindicated, a Book magnified by the Athenian Club, by my worthy Friend Mr. Giles Ferrin, now dead, a sound Calvinist, and others. How? as we call all the Snake in the Grass, as an unanswerable Piece against the Quakers,

kers, not for Passages mistaken of
 others, which prove him to be better
 acquainted with the History of the
 Quakers than Presbyterians, and o-
 ther Dissenters. I justify not this
 Gentleman (for such he is in his De-
 portment, as much as becomes a Mi-
 nister; and no more, a happy hit) in
 his Particularities; but in his main
 Design. Is not the Contexture curi-
 ous, the Notions deep, the Argu-
 ments solid, and the whole a work
 of Art? I vindicate his censure of
 Dr. Grise's Extravagancies. Are
 base little Stories a Reply? They
 who have thrown dirt in his Face
 have daubed their own Hands. What
 a shameful thing is it, for London Mi-
 nisters, who should be a good Exam-
 ple to us in the Country, to be worse
 than we? That they cannot contend
 about a Cause, but they must seek for
 little false Tales to revile the Persons,
 (an Error on all Hands) I declare
 I think once is enough to answer
 the Doctor's Harangues, and
 it cannot be done better than by Mr.
 W. I and here I refer the Reader, be-
 ing not willing, *Adum agere*.
 But

to But to this great Objection. I remember when I first read Mr. Pemble, (of Glouc.) that great Man, and found him calisted, *quand hoc*, and that he smartly replied to many Objections that lay before him, I expected an Answer to one, which I saw he thought not of, if he had thought of it, had he been of that Opinion?

I demand therefore; Did not God once love the Apostate Angels, whom now he hates, when they once loved him, with a Complacential Love, and praised him with Joy and Delight before his Throne? Who can say, These were not some of the Angels that sang and shouted for Joy, when God laid the Foundation of the Earth. How strange would it be to deny their Complacential Love to God, to follow Gods complacential Love to them? Did God hate them, when they loved him? Speak out if you think so. Well: Doth not God hate them now, since their Apostacy, and will he not do so for ever? Now, if God could Love Angels and then hate them, and not be changed (because they be so) then can he hate

hate unconverted Men, and afterward
 love them, and not be a changeable
 God, but they are changeable Men.
 Love, in *affection* or *essence*, I meddle not
 with in God, only *in use* it is not
 Love ignorant, and you cannot deny
 is not predicated Univocally of God
 and us, as if it were a thing of the
 same Nature. No, it is not so much.
 Nor yet, *visibilem habet*, *invisibilem*.

2. Is it spoken of God and us e-
 quivocally. It is not so little: As if
 only one Name, or for two distinct
 things quite different. But,

3. Analogically, some resemblance
 therein, between our Complacential
 Love and Gods. God speaks to us
 after our manner, as Nurseries to Chil-
 dren.

This being the result of free
 thoughts in then Reading, and never
 meeting with it from any Man, and
 finding many pleas'd with it, I have
 desired a reply from some *Crispian*.
 Say they,

1. It may be those Apostate An-
 gels stood not long, not so long as
 Man. *Apoc. viii. 12*. A Thousand
 Years and an hour is all one in this
 Case.

2. It

by it may be these Angels were
 Shown as soon as Creatures. That
 could not be said to have
 left their first Station, if they had no
 first Station antecedent to that of Sin
 and Misery. They could not be said
 to fall, if they had not once stood.
 They fell from the Love of God
 actively, and passively consider'd
 their Love to God, or Gods Love to
 them. If Heaven had never been the place of
 their Making but Hell a fiery one, if
 this black Nation were of one. They
 have no ground Creature, the Semites
 For large Discourses about Immortal
 Aits, I care not. It was ever Account-
 ed by Divines, no small Error in
 Thomas Aquinas, That if he met with
 any Axiom or Proposition in Philosophy
 especially his Ethics, against any Do-
 ctrine or Dogma of his, he would as
 gravely reply to it, as if he had met
 with any Text from Scripture. I care
 not for Philosophical Essays about
 the immortality of the Soul, or the
 immortality of the Holy Spirit. That
 God hates all the workers of iniquity.
 It is evident, all unconverted Men be
 workers

workers of Iniquity, therefore the Conclusion is good. God hateth them all. Doth God hate them, and yet complacently Love them too? Doth not God and the Devil divide the whole World? Are not all unconverted Men call'd every where in Scripture, the Children of the Devil? I profess, I am ashamed to attempt to prove it. Were they (*My Masters*) never of the Devils Kingdom, but always of Christ, Who are said to be Translated from the Kingdom of Satan,

to the Kingdom of Christ? Pray Sirs,

Awake. Be not so drowsy any longer. Open your Eyes. Rub them well.

Look upon your Bibles once again.

You may see many of your Notions,

as wild as that of your Master. That

Christ when he suffer'd, had the Filthiness

of our Sin upon him, and so it continued till

he sweat it out, and could not see the Face

of God, till after he Rose from the Dead.

Where was he in the mean while?

1. Was he in Hell, to suffer there

as Bishop Latimer thought, in one of

his honest homely Sermons before

King Edward? Not to triumph there

neither, as others say.

2. Was he in the Kingdom of Satan,

to be a Slave to the Devil, and to be

tormented by him?

B

Was

2. Was he not with the Thief in Paradise, as he assur'd him? Did he not there see the Face of God? What mad stuff is this? I hope, you will not think, as I once heard a Great Dr. of Divinity say in his Pulpit, *Christ went with the Thief to Heaven, to welcome him there, and went down to Hell after.* I Pray Sirs, Tell the Drunkards and Covetuous Men, That they shall not inherit the Kingdom of God and of Christ: Not that God Loves them with a Complacental Love, if they be Elect whilst unboly. I know it is true *Jacob have I loved,* Rom. 13. 9. And I will not say, he might be sanctified from the Womb: If so, yet this is spoken on a Reason common to all the Elect: How? With the Love of benevolence, not Complacency till Conversion; Laugh on at this distinction. I will make it good if occasion be.

If King William now saw a most deformed Woman, Deformity it self of the worst body, temper, and morals in the World. Her Face, and Hands, and all full of running sores. Her Tongue full of Blaphemies against God and Him, she cursed both and spit at the Name of all that was august and sacred.

Suppose

Suppose, King *William* knew that God would, (or he could) after some Years, make her the most comely, the most wise, the most Pious Woman upon Earth, and so the best Wife, and he intended when this change was made, to make her his Queen.

Could King *William* Love this Woman, with a Complacential Love, when he saw her sores dropping their filth wherever she went, and cursing him every word she spake? What fearful, frightful words, to some Ears, are the words, *Repentance, Duty, Obedience to the Gospel, Good Works, &c.* They must be fed with Sugar-Plumbs who had need of other Diet. They must have Cordials that are not sick nor faint, but rather want working, purging stuff. How weakly talked *Saltmarsh* of Free Grace? Mr. *Baxter* said truly, *He was sorer to learn a Catechism than trouble the World about his Notions.* Was not this a Golden Rule to be laid down to Doubting Persons, O poor Christian, believe till you do believe—And when the Question was of God's Work within a Man, he would answer to God's Work without a Man, *Christ*

bath repented, saith he, and believed for thee, &c.

Will not the *Houling* of the followers of that Man of Ignorance and Confidence that hath lately troubled the World, yet convince? His Doctrine and Morals, are talkt of every where. God testifies from Heaven against this untoward Generation. I saw several Letters lately from Worthy Congregational Divines, and People to some here in London, who greatly bewail these Abominations. They tell us of some that openly denied Christ preach'd *Repentance*, because he preach'd *glad Tydings*; and when it was openly testified against, and said: But Christ did Preach Repentance. The Answer was, But did he not go beyond, or beside his Commission?

For my part, I am in continual Expectation of a New Sect of Ranters, as bad as the old ones, which may provoke our Governours to take away our Liberty from us, seeing it is so abused. I have heard some have thus threatned, if they find *Evangelism* a thriving weed.

In Gloucestershire, in a Town I knew, were there in *Olivers* Days, a Sort of Ranters headed by a Preacher, (whether first a Linen-Draper I know not) they would say, *We could not take off our Caps when with you, and would swear as a part of their Christian Liberty.* One of them told a serious Friend of mine, *What talk you of Sin? I would make no scruple to kill you, but I will not do it, because I love you.* One of them at last was a God, and the other was a Devil. Then God would speak to the Devil, and the Devil to God, *If thou art a God, &c.* One of this Company was such an Instance of Divine displeasure, that he went up and down Winter and Summer, Thirty Years barefooted and distracted, I have often heard some of his Blasphemies from him, (*Travellers of Marsfield*).

What, I pray, did Cob and his followers do at *Ety*?

To hear a Fool say, *The Gifts and Callings of God are without Repentance,* and therefore Repentance is no duty now, might make any lick to hear it. When it is so clear, *Paul* speaks of Gods not Repenting of the blessings he bestows on us, not of our not Repen-

#

(30)

ting of Sins against him. *I that know these things, Pardon me, if I give you timely warning.* —

It hath been no small Reflection, I confess, on the Orthodox Congregational Divines, that they never had the Courage to appear against the *Crispians*, tho' they have against another sort of Men. A few sheets in Print, would have prov'd your Zeal lay not only against these, but them: Those unclean Birds would shelter themselves under your Wings, as if theirs.

Mr. Zee, indeed, in a late Ingenious Discourse (by which he hath much oblig'd the World) says plainly in his Preface, *That I may appear impartial, I do declare, That I believe, that the Antinomian Dotages, have much occasion'd the growth of the Socinianism and Deism of the Age.*

I had lately a Letter from a Congregational Divine in Devon, who thus writ me. *There is not one Congregational Divine in this County, that owns Crisp his Notions, nor any, but some Anabaptist. It is so apparently impious and ungrounded, that I am astonish'd, how Men of Principles can in-*

you

89

cline

cline to it. But what hath it to do with Independents, or Independents with it? If it did, any thing flow from Congregational Principles, I should think my self unsafe in those approaches, my Judgment hath made to them, and must flee with borrow from them, tho not to the other extream. Some of that persuasion here cry, We are all wisdom, we shall be the most Contemprible Persons on Earth, if these ignorant Presbyters thus go on. For my part, I solemnly profess, that I think Arminianism itself, to be a lovely, innocent thing, in Comparison of Crispianism, the Low Church's Doctrine, Old Protestantism (and that in the Supralapsarian way, but about this, I never much contend.) Now what must I expect from some Men? Oh; this is he, that began well, and hath since made his Recantation: We know the Circumstances of it, and before whom. Did I begin well? Then I continue so, for in my *Vindicia*, I do disown Dr. Crisp, his abominable Phrases and Doctrine, foreseeing I should be reported by some to be of that Number. If you can tell all about the Recantation, You can tell more then I. It is a false Charge, as some great

Men know, who lately have had the contrary under my own hand : Who indeed I know with it, yet I will be free.

When I saw some Congregational Divines, as well as others say, *My Prudence was too sharp* : I have said to them and others, *That I could wish two or three Passages out of the Book, as James 3. 8, &c.* Tho I yet add, other Pious and Learned Divines said, It was not too sharp, particularly, The Famous Mr. Giles Fermin (since dead) in a Letter to me, whose Name and Habitation he diligently enquired after, being pleas'd with the whole of the Book. After some undeserved Expressions of respect, he tells me, That having to deal with such an intolerable Applauder of himself, and Villifier of others, *No moderate Man*, (they were his words) can say, I was too sharp, &c. To whom I replied the same Day, *That some moderate Men did think it was too sharp, and I was of their Opinion, not of his*—Those were, I well remember, my very words. I did intend to have Animadverted also on the Book of Universal Redemption, published by that

good

good Man, (for so I doubt not he is) Mr. Read, I did intend it should have been the work of time, as well as pains, for I profess, might it who will, and say it is an *unlearned Tract*: It made me sweat to Reply to some difficulties. Mr. *Fermins* words to me in a Letter, I shall not forget: Who wisht me a *good deliverance*, for said he, *I know not what to say, being not able to Answer the Arguments on either side*. When I further examin'd Dr. *Crisp*, upon the foremention'd Charge, and saw the *Gangreen* spreading in the City, I had done with that matter, and, undesired by any Man, I threw my Papers against Universal Redemption in the Fire: And resolv'd to trouble my self no more about any thing Mr. *Sylvester*, or Mr. *Read* should publish, whilst *Crispianism* was on the thriving hand. Suppose, a Man should strike out one of my Eyes, another should cut off both of my Legs, after which would I most earnestly send a Hue and Cry? Had I known the City so well as I do now, and its present Contagion, I had said less of another sort of Men, and more of you. And now Call this a Recan-

tation if you please, for it is the greatest I ever made. What have you to do with our Controversies? You know the plain, common, familiar apt Comparison; If two Dogs be a fighting, if a Bare break in, they both give over, and set upon him? When we were fighting, comes the *Arminian* Bare, which makes us give over, and set upon him. Nay, to be plain, I would not be ashamed to Call on the *Arminians* themselves, to help in this work, against this dangerous, exceeding dangerous Enemy.

I dread neither you nor them, as they well know. I have no pre-empt, but refuse it. A negative respect, I shall be thankful to you or them, or any other for.

For my part, I declare, I hear good sound, well studied Sermons both at *Primers*, and *Salters-Hall* Lectures. But may it not displease if I should say, If it pleas'd them at *Primers-Hall*, to Preach more of Christ as a Sanctifier, as well as Justifier, and them of *Salters-Hall* to Preach more of Christ as a Justifier, as well as Sanctifier. They should have my Consent, and I doubt not, of many that hear them. Would not

not this be a good mixture, and make such Savoury Meat as the Soul of a serious Christian Loveth?

They are all Men of Worth, and Learning, and God Loveth them better then they love one another.

It is the good honest Complaint of some Congregational Men, who, when they bring their Children, and Servants with them to their Meeting; hear so much of *Comforting of Saints*. What is this, say they to them? Who should hear awakening Discourses of Conversion, and Subjects suitable for them. Besides, say I, we live in an Age, wherein Religion runs at so low an Ebb, That where one Good Man need be told of Comfort, a Hundred had need to be told of Mortification, Watchfulness and Circumspection, and of greater usefulness. Where do we see so many fainting sad Christians, that so many Cordials must be brought, when there is need of Gripping, working things? They must not be told much of Duty, Activity for God, this is Legal Preaching forsooth. All Lenatives, no Purgatives: What shall be said to great Professours (Pillars too) - that make
nothing

nothing of an officious Lye to help out a bargain, of sitting long at the wine, of defrauding others; Sins inconsistent with grace if continued in? Let them think what they please, do these want Comfort? It is true, when the Dogs are beat, the Children cry; yet this is sometimes necessary notwithstanding; Sinners must be told their own, as well as Believers theirs.

One great Cause of the aforementioned Corruptions, I take to be the Preaching of unqualified Tradesmen, especially, such as set up for the only Gospel Preachers.

Many Tradesmen may be, and are such as may deserve the Name of prudent wise Christians, but yet make woful ignorant Teachers. *Who is sufficient, saith Paul, for these things?*

Had Paul liv'd in London, he would ha'e met with some that say, *Who is not sufficient for these things?*

Obj. But the Spirit can do this work.

Ans. But we see in you he doth it not. And I may say to such, what Peter said to Ananias and Sapphira: *Why have ye agreed to lye to the Holy Ghost?* You that never had the sense and reason becoming Men, what pretend

tend you, to extraordinary discoveries?

Obj. Peter was a *Fisher-man*, &c.

Ans. Is there no difference between a *Fisher-man* made wise, and that to work Miracles, and Write excellent *Greek Epistles*, and between ignorant *Plowmen*, *Weavers*, *Taylor*s? Is it not a lovely Charming sight, to see an Association of such Reverend Persons, and not two Scholars among them? Who tell the People, Christ is the Subject of all our Righteousness: *In the Lord have I Righteousness and Strength*. He is the Efficient of all, but not the Subject.

Obj. I Pray, What Qualifications are necessary?

Ans. Such as you want, and that is enough.

Christ promiseth, *I will give you a Mouth and Wisdom*, whereby you shall convince *Gain-Sayers*. Mouth, there is many a time enough, or more then enough, but for *Wisdom*, no Man can see it. Are they *Ambassadors* for Christ, *Pastors*, *Shepherds*, *Angels*, Such as should give themselves wholly to these things? *Workmen needing not to be ashamed*, rightly dividing the Word of Truth?

Truth? And yet such as cannot talk better than Women (not as Preachers) to such a Question as this,

How know you the Scriptures to be the Word of God? All the Answer I have known from such Preachers, is by the Spirit.

Is it not enough for them to be ignorant, but must they be so frantick to go into Pulpits to discover it?

They sweat at the end of their work, and wise Men at the beginning. They can Preach, they say, often, and make nothing of it. Thou Fool, said Paul in another Case. Let alone, say I, the work to qualified Men who Preach seldom, and make something of it. What Dolly is it for Crispians to tell the World, Dr. Owen once Preacht to them, *Pure Doctrine of Justification*, when it is so evident, if this be true, that Dr. Crisp Preacht impure Doctrine.

For our New Gospeller lately set up, some say, He hath been an Ingenious Man, others say, No: If the former be true, God seems to make him on purpose, to let the World see Preaching is quite another thing, then what most think it to be. An Ingenious

Tradefman

Tradesman can no more make an *Ingenious Preacher* on a sudden, then he can an *Ingenious Physician* and *Lawyer*, or then an *Ingenious Preacher*, can make an *Ingenious Tradesman*, or *Linen-Draper*.

For his *Morals*, I find his *Friends* shaking their *Heads*. I leave them to dispute this matter. But there is a *Question* to be askt, *Seeing his Father and Mother were both Quakers*, When was our *Reverend Linen-Draper* Baptis'd?

But we are told of two *Men of* worth, that seem to *Countenance* him, out of respect to them. I will not say all I can. Yet some deny it, and I am sure, they care not to own it. I shall not say much of the *Rude Treatment* (much talkt of) to me and others, when we went to hear him *Wednesday* before and after his *Text*, lest it should be thought to be the *Great Cause* of my appearing against him. Which I declare to be no Cause at all, but yet might be a sufficient excuse to *Quit* him up, and send him to the *Tribes in Israel*, with, see, consider and *Speak* your *Minds*. I and others did, as *God* says, *Go down to*

Amos

see, whether it were according to the Cry :
And intended to Apologize for him,
If I found the Charge of Nonsensical
Heterodox Stuff, not true. But I
found according to the Cry thereof,
or worse.

The *English Tongue*, which is so
Rich, and *Copious*, yet here hath that
Penury, that it will hardly afford
words, to set forth the Vanity of this
late Preaching Linen-Draper, whom
I was desir'd to hear, which I did with
reluctancy. Before I give an Account
of what I then heard from Mr. *M-*
their borrowed Pulpit : I think it
proper, to anticipate an Objection by
Men that may Love only Fine, and
Polite Strokes, as, That I am too
sharp in this, and some other Causes.
I will only put them in mind, That
when *Hemlock* pass over the *Altar*,
and has a hard Passage, Fire, Vinegar,
Salt, are us'd to make his way, which
in other places he did not. That I
am almost Fifty Year Old, and never
appear'd in any Controversy, till a
Year since coming to *London*. A second
Amsterdam, of which it was
ser said, *He that has lost his Religion*,
may there find it. I take this to be one
Cause,

Cause, why our Tradesmens Mouths
water after a Pulpit. They see in some
Clubs here in the City, they may speak
their Opinions before Ministers (and
controul them to boot, as if their
Inferiours) Latin, and Greek words
thrown out, and half of them Grack.
And Glorious Nonsense, and splendid
impertinences, in Divinity and Philo-
sophy, as if they were infallible Di-
ctatours. Nay, one shall assert per-
fection, another deny Original Sin. An-
other the Resurrection. Another as-
sert the Salvation of Damned Souls, and
Devils, which hath try'd out the pa-
tience of the most Patient Ministers,
and made private Men doubt all Re-
ligion. Not only particular Ministers,
but the *function it self* shall be ques-
tion'd, and that before their Faces, by
Anti-ministerial Men, who admire
themselves, when others despise
them. To go on,

When I heard the most judicious
Congregational Divines, try out of
imprudence of two of their Brethren,
as Favourers of *this Man* and his Do-
ctrine. Some justifying him, another
censuring, I was prevail'd to go to
the Meeting, and as I desired my
Friends

Friends before, *not to smile* (which is a
 Rule to me, if at a Quakers Meeting,
 or any Worship.) We sat with all
 imaginable Reverence, when the
 Gentleman ascends the Pulpit, and
 sat down with stretch Arms, as if it
 had been my Lord of Canterbury
 his Grace, we heard the Prayer; and
 this Zealous *Crispian Would-be*, brings
 the Controversy even there. That
 when God gave *Moses* a perfect Righteous-
 ness of his own, he threw it away, and
 said a *Good Creature* may be, that when
 God had provided a perfect Righteousness
 in another, he would have Righteousness
 of his own. When Praying for Mr.
Mahers (then Sick, as if his Patron)
 he gave God thanks for *Raising him*
up, and will it not so, when he threatened
to take away the Champion of the Cause.
 After most impudent and uncharita-
 ble words, The Text was Nam'd,
 John 11. 21. Which compare with
 10. 23, 24, 25, &c. Were they not
 intended Murders? Sir, we would
 see *Jesus*. We, or Who? Whether
 Greeks, or Gentiles, he would not say—
 Sir, *Philip*—And here we were told a
 Lubberly Lecture of manners. We
 should go directly to our Friends, &c. And
 now

now a Doctrine. Doct. That it is naturally Written in the Heart of every Man, to desire a Mediator to come to Christ. They should not have askt Philip, but gone directly to Christ. O rare discoveries! Now let the Calvinist and Methodist look to themselves. Some must bring Humility to Christ, that is their Mediator. They must come humble. Now we are all knockt down: All was Condemn'd. The whole culpable, and that all was done out of Curiosity, and their Request not gratified, as far as we read, yet this Observation was laid down.

Doct. That is the Duty of every Man, to desire to see Jesus the Saviour. Not the Lawgiver, or Commander, for he was no such. He gave no Commands, if he had, he had added to the Law, there were Commands enough before. And then an Anthem was thrown out, Confusion be their reward, that say it, &c.

All Qualifications were Condemn'd. And now we are told, Abraham was an ungodly Man, long after he was call'd, and believers (after long such) were advis'd to plead the promise with God; Lord, thou hast promis'd to justify the

the ungodly, I came to thee as an ungodly Man, justify thou me.

An ungodly Believer is Linen-Drapers Divinity. After our New Gospeller, had Condemn'd all Qualifications, Behold, he is Metamorphis'd into a Legalist upon a sudden. He tells us, *That whoever comes to Christ without being sensible of his Sin and Misery, should come in Vain.*—

What mean these Men by *Coming to Christ*? Christ Calls, *are Math. 9. 12. Them that labour and are heavy Laden*, (Not with Ceremonies, as some say, but Sin and sorrow) to come to him, His word shall stand. *They shall look on him whom they have Pierced and Mourne;* Zach. 2. 7. In its primary intention, respects the Conversion of the Jew, which *Joseph Mead* and others, believe will be in the like way, as *Paul* was Converted by a Voice from Heaven, and therefore can only be Accommodated here. Dare you say, There is no way to Mourning but here? I affirm, a Man may repent a right from Subjects of Sin, Hell, Judgment to come, &c. And this will I undertake, and other things, if any reply to this, make it more necessary then as yet I can

can

can see it is. More stuff there was in that speaking (not Preaching) which I have forgotten, or care not to mention; I have taken care to consult another Minister then with me, who once intended to Print the Sermon with Notes, but some considerations diverted him. I have not willingly err'd in sense nor words. He can testify the same. One Notion comes on a sudden, *We must not rely on the doctrine, but on the merits of Christ, but his Person.* I hope, no Man will expect I should disparage my self, to Confute his absurdities. They that cannot, or will not see them, discover what they are. Might not the Doctrine be Doct. *It is the Duty of every Man, to desire to imitate Jesus.* Oh Folly!

I had heard before the madness of the Man, against all others. That before a great Gentlewoman this was said, as is say'd and believ'd, *That the Anabaptist distinguished to feel them in the Water, &c.*

Which none but a Dammy Boy, I thought would have said.

The foremention'd Minister, with others, heard him once before on this Text, *Mat. 23. 26. And they were all afraid*

afraid of him, not believing he was a Disciple. And this Doctrine was laid down.

Doct. That it is a difficult thing for true believers, to believe others are so. When every Child knows the Circumstances. Well, Simon Magus was brought for an instance of a Preacher, who had humane Learning, but not the Call of the Spirit. When no humane Learning had he, but Magical Diabolical Tricks, and who never was a Preacher. To say, *If he was not one, he would have been one, is a poor Defence.* Well, Paul had the Call of the Spirit without humane Learning—Why Name I what every Ignoramous can confute, except one? Must Women be call'd wicked Women, for talking much of trouble for sin and fear, and a Story told. God indeed convinced me, that I was a great Sinner, but I was never troubled for it. I desired by a kind Letter *This same Motion* (so accounted) to meet me, and some Congregational Ministers justly offended with these things, to give us a fair Meeting amicably to debate matters. That they would give us their Reasons for his being a Preacher, and hear

hear ours againſt it, believing, Here is a ſecond *Dazar*, entering on the Stage, worſe every way then the firſt, but it was not granted.

In another work I did, I now'd againſt Wind and Tyde, now with both, being earneſtly deſired by many to undertake this work. Congregational Men, as well as others, who propoſed fairly for its Encouragement. Yet I care not to uſe words of that Nature ſome Wiſe and Good Men do. " That ſuch a one is a Preacher of the Devils making. " That had they been there, they would have pull'd him out of the Pulpit. " That they ſwore to hear a Repetition of his Folly. So great is the ignorance that Reigns in this City, That if a Man Preach and ſay any thing of God, *Chriſt*, free Grace, and *Heaven*, they cry it is a *Preloſt Word*, the no ſenſe nor truth deliver'd. You that talk ſo much of Free Grace, Remember it is free, tho Devils and Damp'd Souls be not at laſt ſay'd as ſome here ſay; Tho all Men, the worſt of Men go not to Heaven when they dye, as that Fool that calls himſelf *Eli*, the Prophet ſays, Who hath written an

Alfred

Answer *Clavis* about Miracles; to confirm his Faith, that he is the *Elijah* promised. Yet this Barber cannot talk *English*, and will not say it positively; he is *Elijah*; Shall his Lying Miracles convince us, that he says, do not make him conclusive?

Every *Idle Jack* now shall be ready to see in the Face of Ministers, and leave them as no Gospel Preachers, tho never so serious, or sound, or accurate. This Barbers Doctrine is, That God is the Author of Sin, and when they have serv'd his end; He makes them damned, and takes them to Heaven.

Antinomianism is a lovely thing with now not a few. We read of such of Old. I enquire whether the words we Translate Sons of *Belial*, which the *Septuagint* sometimes render Lawless Children, or, Sons against Law, *Sanctus*, 1 Sam. 2. 12. Might not be rendered by our Translators, had they known such a Tribe as we do: The *Antinomian* Children. When the Angels in Heaven thus turn'd *Antinomians*, Heaven was no place for them; And when these *Sons of Belial*, Perverse Children (by which the *Septuagint* elsewhere calls Sons of *Belial*) per-

perswaded our first Parents to turn
Antinomians, to Gen. 3. 1, 4, 5. *Yes*
bath, God said—Paradise was no place
 for them. And when some among
 us turn *Antinomians*, may it not be a
 Query, whether the Church should
 any longer be a place for them? I
 affirm, Dr. *Crisp* doth often question
 the usual methods of Conversion, con-
 firmed by Scripture, Divines, and all
 Christians Experience, whether they
 marr'd not all the work till he hang
 out his new light?

I humbly pray our Accusers to
 be at leisure for a while, and
 not for Expeditions sake pass sen-
 tence on us, before they hear our
 Cause.

For such as are come to that high,
Ministers and People, that they will not,
 some Confess Sin, others, not Pray for
 Pardon; I think they are of all Crea-
 tures most miserable.

You, as your Old Brethren, the
 Crucifyers of the Lord Jesus, are
 not Christ Exalters but Debasers; you
 do as they, Bow the Knee before him
 with a Hail, but all but a Mockery.
 You say, you put the Crown on the
 Head of Jesus Christ, but it is one of
 G Thorns,

Thorn, and the Scepter in his hand, but it is a *Reed* one, *Mat. 27. 28, 29.* You kiss *Christ* as one *old*; But He may say to you as to him, *Judas betrayest thou the Son of Man with a kiss?*

When Mr. Baxter saw so many Armed Men turn Antinomians, and in flying East, was to believe a *Man* was justified, And after all their strictness grew Lascivious, he in a great Zeal and Fury wrote his Aphorisms of Justification: When this Book came out, he was not then known in Oxford, and they thought it was a Jesuit, till they saw his *Infant Church* Membership and baptism came forth, (the best Book by the way, that ever was written on that Subject) they began to value him. Many Presbyterians follow him, and still do, but none under the Denomination, that I know of, followed *Crisp*. Some unwary Independents, in as great Zeal and Fervour follow *Crisp*, none of them Mr. Baxter, that I know of. And now between these two Contenders, The Question is, *Which is in the right?* Which brings to my mind a Story of Sir W. Raleigh in his History of Ireland, When two were contending which

which was the best Soldier? The
Frenchman, or the Spaniard, one
standing by after all, said, the Eng-
lishman: So the Calvinists, say I, or
Old Protestant. But to return to
our Right Antinomian (for remember,
I am far from Condemning all that
are so call'd) that cry down all
sinnings for sin, &c. Pray Sirs, yet I
Pray, That that Jesus the Lord and
King (startle not at this) who in the
Days of his Flesh cur'd many Demo-
niacs, That he would take you in cure,
who your Evil Spirits Name be Legi-
on, we are many. Should we now be
silent, the stories of the Streets may
cry out against us. A word is suffi-
cient. Remember the followers of
Mr. D. your Meteor *Lawson*, hath
lead your Preachers into Confusion
in their Pulpit Harangues. He that
looks for a Connexion or Correspon-
dency, either of sense or truth, may
look in Vain. And for you, it hath
led you into Lakes and Precipices,
and there left you. Your Preachers
coming any where is Omions, as is
said of a Comet, or the coming of a
Whale into a River. Your Argu-
ments are of no Value, too mean for

any Man to insist much on a solution of them; yet if I cannot put your passions and my own to a demur, I know not what I may in time be forst to do.

I close this part of my work with a known certain story, a worthy Congregational Minister, lately wrote thus to one of the same perswasion, "I ever valued you, which made me at last take up with your Antinomian Principles. I often Preached them up to this Congregation to which I belong, which I found a sober People, but now I have Preacht a Congregation of Christians, into a Congregation of Devils; Two of my hearers went away, and committed suicide, most immediately. I therefore resolve to Preach up the Old Protestant Doctrine, &c. May you all thus repent and reform in this Man? Amen, Amen.

As I ever have been careful to decline Stories upon common fame (not because I doubted them, but could not prove) and therefore mention what I know, I shall now take the like method about our Mekanick Preachers, such

such as
was ac
his N
cher

Hleb.

is i

com

he

the

"

th

ou

Go

"

St

m

"

w

fe

St

co

co

co

co

co

co

co

co

co

co

co

co

co

co

co

co

co

co

co

co

co

such as I knew. One with whom I was acquainted, when Dead: I saw his Notes after he had been a Preacher Thirty Years; the Text was, *Heb. 11. 6.* "For without Faith it

"is impossible to please him; He that cometh to God, must believe that he is; and that he is a Rewarder of them that diligently seek him.

"In these words, faith he, are these three things.

"1. An impossibility, for without Faith it is impossible to please God.

"2. A proposition with a direction. He that cometh to God, must believe that he is.

"3. Here is a reward, and a rewarder of them that diligently seek him. I shall enquire, faith this *Shoe-maker* (for such he had been.)

"1. What God is?

"2. What Faith is?

"1. God is an Omnipotent, Omniscient, and Omnipresent God.

"2. He is an Almighty God. Or.

"There are two sorts of Faith:

"1. The Faith of adherence.

"2. The Faith of relyance—And you may easily imagine, how all was prov'd and spelt. A 3 Ano-

Another Preacht in a Town, to which I was no stranger, on this Text, *God hateth the wicked* : He said it appear'd, God hated them.

" 1. Because he did not Love them.

" 2. Because he could not endure them.

" 3. Because he was full of Indignation against them, &c.

Another *Shoos-maker*, after he had been a Preacher Thirty Years, Printed a Funeral Sermon ; and there we are told, how the Devil *wink't with one Eye on the Good Woman* : O said The, *That I could but see a Troop of Angels* in they came ; and it was a lovely sight. Well, we have the Epitaph for her.

" But as to she, or any other that shall attend upon his Call, shall live and Reign with Christ, and that is best of all.

To *She*, is the Nominative Case to the Verb. On he goes, *Our Friend Lazarus sleepeth*, was the Text, *John 11. 11*. He begins with the Story of *Lazarus* before *K. Edward*, *Beware of Covetousness Named three times*, Change the Subject—What is that beware of Death

Death? He chargeth a Neighbour
for saying, Regeneration was a be-
lieving the Gospel, so as to obey it.
If so, it will follow, says he:

"That every Man hath naturally
something of God in him.

(Transubstantiation say I)

"That it is the Power of Man to
turn himself to God. (Purgatory

say I). Yet, such Men have been
our Lords and Masters, and it was an
honour to come into their Pulpits.

Well, another Neighbour, *not* a
Weaver, after he was a Preacher, per-
haps as long, hath Written a Book

against the Anabaptist, proving out of
the third of *Mat.* 5. 3. *Infant Baptisms*

For he said, truly *Old Baxter's* Argu-
ments could not convince him, and

therefore he would go on a New
Bottom. In this New excellent piece

we are told that *rota* comes from
rota. As if we should say,

that *bon* comes from *beneficio*; and a
Multitude of such Notions. Well,

John baptis'd Infants, All went out, *In-*
fants, the trees — When I told him,

John Preacht to the *all*, and the trees;
Did he Preach to Infants? Yes, said

he, that he did; I will believe the
Word

Word of God, say what you will.
Did You ever Preach to them, said I.
 Whether I did or no, said he, is not the
 question, but what I should do, &c. So
 left him——In that Book, in the Pre-
 face, he brings in this Objection.

“ But many Learned Men urge not
 this Scripture for Infant Baptism.
 He Answers, either those Learned
 Men are alive, or dead: If alive,
 let them plead for themselves: If
 dead, they are either in Heaven, or
 in Hell. If in Heaven, they are of
 my Opinion now: If in Hell, I
 care not what their Opinion is, for
 all their Learning, &c. What shall
 we think of such Fellows who spoil a
 good Cause? I remember when a
 Boy, I heard one Tradesman expound
Covenant for *Consuance*, which
 marr'd the sense.

I wonder, said Dr. Featly, long since,
 That our Pillars and Posts did not
 swell in which was, *On such a Day,*
such a Taylor Preach'd, and such a Wa-
terman Expounded, well, perhaps by
 this time, some High Church men
 will cry out, *You see what is the Fruit*
of your Liberty. Pray, my Masters
 Consider, not only how *Arminians*
 swarm

swarm
 Deist
 The
 Sermon
 one C
 ticles
 2. 1
 nans
 be Ex
 Dr. C
 not o
 1. 1
 water
 Dei. 1
 Loque
 Man
 sully
 I w
 the C
 many
 Years
 It an
 the A
 Clergy
 ven Y
 an Hu
 to th
 storie
 not f
 would

swarm among you, but *Socinians* and *Deists*. Who of ours turn *Socinians*? The last time save one, I heard a Sermon in a Publick Church, I heard one Condemn three good sound Articles of yours. Soon after, I wrote a *Critic* Letter, to prove by the Canons of your Church, he ought to be Excommunicated for that Sermon; Dr. *Crisp*, Mr. *Town*, &c. Were yours, not ours. One came to *Wells* to be ordained, the Examiner put him this sentence; *Apostoli Loquebantur, Magnalia Dei*. He began *Apostoli*, O ye Apostles, *Loquebantur*, look about you; a Great Man sitting by, said, *Magnalia, Mem-fully spoken, Dei.*—

I would not be mistaken, I believe the Church of *England*, had never so many Learned Men in it as of late Years. And therefore, I ever thought it an unworthy disingenuous thing, in the Author of the *Contempt of the Clergy*, written about Twenty Seven Year, since, to run back Fifty, or an Hundred Year before, to find dirt to throw in his Mothes Face: His Stories of *Poverty* and *Ignorance* are not sufficiently qualified. Neither would I be thought to Condemn them,

who take wise private Men, and make them Preachers. I am of Bishop Crofts Opinion, *Naked Truth*. Many such may be useful; I plead for wise Men, whether Schollars or No.

But if this Book fall into the hands of any Papist, He may say, *You see what you are come to since you left us, Fiat Lux*. Written in the Year Sixty, on the Return of King Charles, hath sought to improve these things against us, more then any of that Tribe I ever read. Is it not a Sceptical Atheistical Book at the Bottom, like *sure Footing in Christianity*? He always distinguisheth the Protestant and Presbyterian; and yet says our Reformers, *Luther, Calvin*, and the rest, disown'd Episcopacy, but Queen Elizabeth, saw a necessity to reassume it. A Brave Historian.

Not to say much of your Disputes, when *Dominicans* and *Franciscans* burnt one another; *Jansenists* are accounted Hereticks, and been destroyed as such. A Million of Men in *Italy* have lately run after *Molinus*, that *Hall Quaker*. And now a Sect of *Pietist* swarm in *Germany*. What Wars are between you and the *Greek Churches*? What Notions of ours are so monstrous as Transubstantiation? Par-

Par
str
I
Boo
Oxf
to d
such
Span
wher
up i
2.
burn
tion,
3.
in hi
Chri
Waf
done
was t
is too
For
tilatin
substa
Story
mirac
will n
we cor
but dy
Es Re
This C

Pardon me, I call that Doctrine Mon-
strous, for let me ask you;

1. Did Christ take and eat his own
Body? It was well said of him in the
Oxford Disputation, it is time ill spent
to dispute with them that can swallow
such Contradictions. This is like the
Spanish Story of the Servant, that
when his Head was cut off, took him
up in his Teeth and buried it.

2. Did the Ancient Christians, who
burnt the Bread, left after Consecra-
tion, think they burnt Christs Body?

3. Did ever the Heathen *Julian*
in his Epistles; or any other, twit the
Christians with making a God of a
Wafer, and Eating him when all was
done? Sure, No, then no such thing
was then talkt of, and if not, then it
is too late to tell us so now.

For taking away the Cup, and Mu-
tilating the Sacrament; if Tran-
substantiation were true, yet your
Story of the Blood being by Conco-
mutancy in the Body, is not sufficient,
will not do: For in the Sacrament
we commemorate Christ, not living
but dying; his Blood not running in
his Reins, but separate from them.
This Cup is my Blood shed, this consi-
deration

deration made most of the Great
Conventicle (Pardon the Expression
 for so *Durandus*, hath largely prov'd
 it to be, tho he dyed in your Com-
 munion) almost Mad when urg'd by a
Friar. They flung their Seats, &c. Fa-
 ther *Pauls* Hist.

Can the same Body and Blood
 move and not move, be eaten and not
 eaten at the same time? I cannot Con-
 demn Mr. *Johnson*, and other, that
 say, *These be Contradictions*, and *Con-*
tradictoria non cadunt sub divina poten-
tia. Tho I would take heed how I
 express my self hear, Remembring
 what a Heathen, *Cicero* said in one of
 his Orations, *Pauci & timide de Deo*
Loquimur. Ye are the Body of Christ,
 saith *Paul*. In my apprehension you
 may as well say, The words are
 plain. Therefore;

A Man Converted, is the very Bo-
 dy that hung on the Cross. If you
 say our senses tell us, it is the same
 Body in substance as before; So our
 senses tell us, the same of the Bread.
 If you say, the asserting of this
 would be Monstrous. Not one
 more then yours, as I could easily
 prove, Gen. 41. 26. The Seven Part
 and

and Kine are Seven Tears. We say looking on a Picture againſt the Wall, This is my Father, Brother, Husband, Wife. Some of you confeſs your Doctrine, here cannot be prov'd from Scripture, (tho ſome attempt to do it,) and that we have taken the more favourable ſenſe of the words, had not your Church choſen the contrary.

I ſay again, Do any of theſe I write of, aſſert ſuch a *Monſtrous Doctrine*, as is *Transubſtantiation*? Or do they pray in an *unknown Tongue*? Your Priests here in *England*, were more ignorant then ſome Coblers among us. It is well known, one of them reading the Questions to the Sponſors, for the Child in Baptiſm, *Anno abrenunciabis Diabolum cum omnibus ſuis operibus?* Wondred how the Devil ſhould get in his Chriſtning Book, he blotted out the word *Diabolum*, and put in *Chriſtum*. So the Question was, *Doſt thou Renounce Chriſt with all his Works?*

Another Baptis'd a Child in *Nomine Patria, Filia & Spiritu ſancto*, which one conſtrued I baptize with the *Father's Countrey, the Daughter and the he ſhe Spirit*. And it was question'd, whether this ſhould go for a good Baptiſm, but the
Old

Old *Numpsinus* is better then the
New *Sumpsinus*.

Pray Gentlemen, How was the
Creed said formerly?

Credo in Deum Patrem omnipotentem—
omnis fons Ponki Pilaki—remissionem
peccatorum—In the *English* Popish Ho-
milies of Old, the People were told,
“ How Old Father *Adam's* Bones did
“ ake in his Old Age, and he sent his
“ Son to Paradise for some of the
“ Gum from the Tree of Life, the
“ Angel gave him some. They told
how the Devil was whipt by St. *Francis*
about the Church till he did Roar,
for Pissing in the Holy Pot. How St.
Kentiger's Mother conceiv'd as the
Virgin *Mary*; and a Thousand such
trifles: your Priests understood as
much Divinity as one of your Justices,
who presented a Man for *Frying* of
Bacon as contrary to Law, which was
Firing a Beacon. *Dalton* of *Sher.* Before I
go any furt her, I see a necessity to An-
swer one Objection now on Foot a-
gainst me.

“ Oh! This is he, that hath talke
“ of an Impossibility, of a Legerde-
“ main trick, of teaching a Child
“ Nine Year old very lately. The
chief

" chief things in the Greek Grammar,
 " and to read exactly, construe parse,
 " and say without Book, the Ten first
 " Verses of the Gospel of John, in
 " Greek, and all in three Days.

I affirm, and affirm, again, and a-
 gain, that it is true, and he was ex-
 amined before Mr. Woodhouse, Mr. Gil-
 lard, Mr. Keith, and Mr. Bolton, who
 know there was no Trick in the thing;
 as knows well Mr. Larner, the Father
 of the Child. I am ready for ano-
 ther Proof, if it be doubted or deni-
 ed: I have heard of one that in an
 Afternoon, taught one to read all
 that Chapter! wonder at it who will.
 I do not, but think it feasible, tho' I
 never tried it. I hear I am in some
 Cabals call'd Lyar, and I know not
 what; have pity on your selves Sirs,
 if you have none on me; come forth
 and face me, you that smite me in the
 Dark.

And now I close this with a few
 Words to those Congregational Di-
 vines, whom I plead for.

You see, Brethren, That I have once
 more put my Hand into a Nest of
 Wasps for your sakes, tho' I am not
 of

of your mind about Church Discipline. I own *Presbytery*, and the *Divine Right* of it. How as my *Opinion*, not as an *Article of Faith*, and therefore will never plead for it as such only ;

I disown that little *Creature*, called the *Lay-Elder* ; and think, if it be no *Creature* of God's making, it is a woful one of Man's making. Not that I think the thing so novel as some do, or no older then *Calvin* ; for I am well assured, *Ambrose*, that ancient Father, says,

That it was a Church-Officer of Old, but that the Pride or Negligence of Ministers cast him out, How far he might be out here, I will not say, I am sure he was in his Exposition on the 8th of *Romans*, where he says, *Olim viri mulieres docebant, & baptizabant.*

I paay you, Sirs, advise your Brethren not to be easily imposed on by unqualified Men. One wrote me, *He desired to serve God in the Ministry, and should be glad if he could do him any good.* - They were his Words. When I advised him to keep to his Trade, he told me he was my *Convert*. When he had no help from me, he marries a rich

rich Wife, took up much plate from the Goldsmith, and ran away. Mr. H. of B. was a notorious Example; He was bowed and cringed to, as if a Bishop; how he lived undesired for his Covetousness, Oppression, and died unlamented of all, is too well known, as well as his Preaching other Mens Sermons.

Such Men shall talk much of the Spirit, and what God hath revealed to those Babel, and hid from the Wise; and by such Cants the People take them to be Oracles. Just as Van Helmont would have the World believe he had his new Discoveries in Philosophy, Physick, and Divinity, as inspired by God.

Then he Cants, and then tells of a Dream, of a great Tree laden with Fruit— His Causes and Beginning of Natural Things. 4 Chap. 32.

Well, after all, we are told what a Horse is, and it is put into the Contents of the Chapter, that we may the more note it. That the Horse is the Son of his Four footed Parents, created by the vertue of a Word, into a living, Horse like Soul.

Ending of the Tenth of the
Dane

we

We have a common Saying in some Places, That to hear some things would make a *Forse to break his neck*.

And because that Man hath so many Followers in this City, I shall say the more of him, and see whether he hath not ripped some places of Scripture for his wild Notions, as our giddy Antinomians have for theirs.

In his Two Hundred Queries, about the *Regulation of Human Senses*.

See how this Man, after Prayers to God to discover Mysteries to him, most vilely and foolishly plays with Scripture.

John 12. 35. *Are there not twelve Hours of the Day*—saith he twelve several times, to be born in the World for *Man*.

Ephesians 16. Redeem the time, not twenty or thirty Years only, but hundreds they had misspent before in other Bodies—Here is your Man, your Expositor for you.

What is the Old Man, the *Body of Sin*? but that which they had, bad hundred of Years—As weak is the Talk of this Heretick, about the Ending of the Torments of the Dam-

Damned; Pride will put Men on strange Delusions, as if Inspirations, *Raphael*, he says, was promised him in a Dream.

The things I defend you in, Brethren, are of great Weight and Importance, which all things equally true are not, tho' the Authority of the Revealer be the same.

Broken places of Scripture are used by these Men with as much Fraud, as by the Devil, *Mat. 4. 6.* on Christ; yet by the same Weapon of Scripture rightly used, Christ rewarded on him, wounded him, and overcame him.

One was thoughtful to Print some of Mr. *Davis* his Golden Sayings, such Men will be talking of Men, of Men of Parts. Was it not a lovely thing to see our Linen Draper in his Experiences, and Confessions of Faith, to call Mr. *Williams* a Block-head, in *terminis terminantibus*, which none of his learned Adversaries that know him will say.

When we hear their Blasphemy, we may cry, *Hear, O Heavens!* and be astonished, *O Earth I blush at such things*

things as these, to see those that neither fear God nor reverence Man.

Be you, Sirs, as great Advocates for Christ and Holiness, as they for Satan and Sin; and perswade your Hearers timely, and well, to catechise their Children, that they may escape these Birds of Prey.

We see how many, as a flock of Sheep, run over Hedges, or down in the Sea, one after another. It is dangerous to use hard Phrases, which is the putting the Sword in the Hand of Mad-men, to destroy others and themselves with.

We are told they Preach well, so they may, when they Preach other Mens Works, but many, when their own, make woful work.

A Man may Preach nothing in a Sermon but what is true, and yet none of it true, if it be not true *Hinc*, if not *from hence*, it follows — it is all false. Such was the Preaching of our profound Doctor, if I may so prophane the word *Preaching*, to call a *Mass of Nonsense* by this Name. Now in abundance of places, we hear the croaking of these Frogs.

I know you, and some other Calvinists, Mr. Vail, Mr. Glascock, &c. are here in the City, like speckled Bieds, but may they keep up their Courage notwithstanding. If it please them to appear, I suppose, some of us would as soon venture the Cause in their Hands, as in the Hands of any Men whatever.

Tho' some first Independents allowed the occasional Preaching of their Lay-Elders (an intolerable Practice) yet Dr. Owen did not, and Mr. Gorton in his *Keys* censures it; for which, indeed, Philip Nye, in his Preface censures him.

If some enquire how I came to have so much respect for you above some others, whose Heads and mine better agree about Discipline, I will tell you.

When I was a Member of the University, I frequented Meetings, and there only, received the Lord's Supper. I finding no Presbyterian Congregation there, I desired good old Dr. Rogers to let me sit down occasionally with them, without any Fee, which he did. This Man was a very holy good Man; tho' when a young

Man, very prophane, for which he
was called, Mad Kir of *Lincoln*; but
on a sudden, strooke to the Heart. He
was a grave Man, and wore his Beard
long, for which he was often called,
when Principal of *New-Inn-Hall*, *Old*
Master.

Among other great Things I have
heard of him, these were some:

That he, a rich Bachelor, married
Mrs. *Garbutt*, a Widow, with
Children, and in Debt, and took care
of them all: Her Vertues were her
Dowry, for she was one of the wis-
est and most devout Women upon
Earth: She educated many Gentlewom-
en, taught them an excellent *Cate-*
chisme, which she made, and a *Confessi-*
on of Faith of her own composing.

Another thing was, That being
often in the Company of a good Man,
Capt. *Darbo* found him always sad
and pensive, enquiring into the
Cause, he was told, he owed above a
Hundred Pounds, which he could not
pay. The good, kind, compassionate
Doctor, paid the Money, and takes
up the Bond, without saying any
thing to the Man. Then comes
to visit him, and asked him, *Why are*
you

you not pleasant as you were wont to be? He would not tell; Then the Doctor delivered to him the Bond: *It is the sight of this make you pleasant?*

He would often say to his good second self, We have much Money in such a Bag; such and such poor People want some of it — Give me such an active Man. I have often wondered, that having so many ordinary Lives Printed, the Lives of this Couple were not so.

But I am now on sudden told some Wits in the City design a Lampoon upon me, If I thus proceed, to which I Answer.

1. What? What? And he Advocate for our ignorant Linnen-Draper? I doubt, I shall soon prove them, *Wits, Would-bee*, as this Jack a *Crispian Would-bee*, for he understands no Mans Principles.

2. There is sent me by an unknown hand already, an ingenious Lampoon upon our Linnen-Draper, which some that know him say, is an Exact Description of his Birth, Parents, manner of Life, such as I have seldom heard of. For my part, I abhor all things of that Nature, and was about to send

it

is to him with this Declaration: That I would not use much less Print, and such Paper. This way of Answering betrays any Cause whatever.

3. That two *Lampoons* are Printed against me already, to which I have given a Sober Reply; Let this be Answered before a New one be made. For my part, I keep both their Papers by me in the Window to look on, when dull and melancholy to revive me. Indeed Gentlemen, Print such *Lampoons* every week, I care not. I am so Zealous for the King, and so Compassionate on Poor Tradesmen: That if you please to further the Customs of the King for Paper, or help Printers, and Stationers, and Book-sellers, you may; I think all Men now conclude that read my Defence, That never were more Impudent Eyes told by any Man, then by B. C. and W. C. Men that are ashamed to own their Books, tho I not mine. I wonder how they dare to be seen among them, that know what they have done. Not one Man comes to me for the promised five Pound, tho a half Year be past.

And of such new Books, I have
For

For my part, I am much of *Luthers* Mind and Spirit; When he was told, that his Books were burnt at *Rome*, if they said he burn my Books, I will burn theirs.

I may say to many, I had almost said to most in this City, what *Paul* did to the *Corinthians*, *You suffer Fools gladly, seeing your selves are wise.* This I will be bold to say, I met with as wise Men in the Countrey, in *Bristol*, in *Plymouth*, and elsewhere, as here. Some here are very angry for my saying so, and boast what they have read and seen, that to my certain knowledge cannot talk common sense, nor I think turn one *Offen* into the *119 Psalm* into, not only *Greek*, but true *Latin*. Some in the Countrey had need to send them Books, as much as they these. I confess, I was no Match for some I once Converſed with, but for many Hectoring Persons here. It is not a shame for some to say, *It is an Honour for their Countrey Brethren to come into their Pulpits, &c.* When perhaps, some of them think it a disgrace to come after *Weavers*, *Taylor*, who made the Pulpits stink of them long ago.

D

It

It is easy for Men to write Poetical or Practical Books, and run to the Author and that Author and make Collections here and there; Then take down Poet, then some Critick, Leigh, or any other, then Books of the Subject they Write about. When one would think for Men of reading, sense, and years, Their Heads should be their Libraries, &c. But I must not, approaching too near any thing that looks like boasting, lest my Friends in the Countrey should think, I have been along in London, that I am troubled with the London disease.

Where Men are charged high, what is said openly by almost all, is quire, all is denied. for lying, it is worse then bad. The private hearers here, are no more judicious, then in obscure Counters abroad. Every Quack in Physick, or Divinity, or any other thing, if he runs to London, finds it as fit a Recepracle for him, as any place whatever. To see some of the greatest Congregations in the City, whom all know must be sent to School, yet these Gentlemen of their Brethren and Talents forsooth, of able Men, and raising

Wh

When I pray is that? Men of good
 things, that make disfigur'd faces, and
 speak to God, as if talking with their
 Fellows, &c. To the great grief of
 the learned Men that hear them, or
 converse with them? And yet these
 shall *Condemn Tradis-men Preaching*
 too.

I am also told, by this work I shall
 lose many friends in the City. I An-
 swer, it is a great Question, whether
 I have many Friends here to lose. I
 have had many in the place from
 whence I came, and may again have
 more elsewhere. I value, Friends, *Non*
numero sed pondere. My few here may
 be better, then some Mens Many.
 One old true Protestant is worth
 Ten Innovators.

Some object, They like not this
 way of writing; all should be confi-
 denced by Arguments from Scripture. I
 answer,

You like not this way nor the other
 neither, when against your darling
 corrupt Notions.

Many wise Men like this way well,
 if you do not; an historical Account
 of Men and their Notions, is used by
 all. Is Mr. Lob's Book to be disputed

about the juggling Tricks of Arminians and Socinians, because he confutes not by Scripture, their Doctrine he mentions?

3. Must Men run all the same way?

This is done so well already, that much cannot be added; done by a curious Hand.

4. Yet I have insisted upon the chief things from Scripture. Look again; Many Books said to be New Books, have little new but the Title: old stale Arguments are mentioned without end.

I shall not trouble you with an Account what clapt a Superfedeus upon my not appearing sooner; only acquaint you, that this was ready for the Press almost three Months past.

For the Controversy now on foot, so far as it relates to Matters of Fact, I make my self no Judge. I have proposed a fair way, as the Digladiators both own, to bring the Matter to a fair Issue.

To appoint a convenient Time and Place to debate these Matters, agreeing upon Articles before hand, to manage all.

That

That a Moderator be chosen, who shall have Power to appoint to both their time of speaking and to silence hard Words; so may we know these Matters of Fact asserted by some, denied by others. (Next we must only enquire when the last Paper will be answered; and so might this Controversy take no more Air! One replied, This might have been done; but that the first Aggtellor appearing in Print, must be so met with, which is true for once. But is the Advice now too late? I beseech them to think of it.

I beg my Reader to consider, if there were so many Flats in that one (and but one) Sermon, I heard from the Reverend *Lucas-Drop*, how reasonable it is to think many more are in other wild Discourses of his; where he makes not so great a Preparation, expecting not such an Auditory; yet see the Misery of uncatechised Heads. This was applauded by the *rude illiterate Mob*, some of which have the Impudence to ask us, What think you, we cannot judge of a

Minister and his Ability? No, no more than of a Physician or a Lawyer. Such may be a Quack, an Emperick, as far as you or I know.

Wherefore choose such as are approved of by Men of the same Profession. Should we by Ministers of Sacraments? If you must choose your Pastor, I hope you must not ordain him: they that do it, must look well to it, that they lay Hands *judiciously* on so *Many*, and therefore they are Judge of their Abilities, not you, to say, *We have chosen him, and will have him.*

I once lived with a conceited Country Farmer, who would tell me, *If he were in my place, he should make the People quake, and quake he should, for the dread of the Lord, of which he dreamed in his Pillow.* O Sirs! What do you mean?

I would often tell him that was a Preacher for him, but a Stage-player for me.

In a place where once I lived, was a Man much followed. He could expound the hardest places of Scripture in a fuddain. — One put him that place, *The Children of Israel shall be many days*

with-

without a King, and without a Priest,
and without an Ephod, and without a
Terephim. He began without Civil,
or Ecclesiastical Government; as for
Ephods and Terephims, Weight and
Measures, I shall not say much of them.

He once, as is said, patching up a
Sermon out of Dr. Hally, and Dr.
Lan, their Works, one being asked
how he liked it, said, It was freely
done. A preaching Mithradate
told me, You must have Ten Shillings a
Day when we sometimes have but Twelve
Pence. To whom I replied, This is just
as if a Quack in Physick should then dis-
course with a Physician.

And said I, Old H. How couldst thou
in conscience take the Shilling, you should
have returned two Groats again.

Bless me, thought I, when I heard
our Reverend Linen-Draper, If this
be Gospel, I never heard the Gospel prea-
ched till now, and hope I never shall hear
such Gospel more. If any ask, Why
confute I not more what he said & be-
cause not worth it. Must I prove
Christ to be a Law-giver, &c. Or
prove Christ gave Commands &c. He
and Elijah the Barber-Prophet, desire
it, that they may be taken notice of.

These

These cry, *Peace, Peace, where there is no Peace, and few Cushions under Mens Elbows.* If Dr. Crisp had been by David, he would have informed him better, and we had had wonderful Psalms, no doubt; for David was not well acquainted with the Covenant of Grace, &c. Luther Thunders against the Antinomians, so called in his days, in his Table-Talk; and yet some have the confidence to tell us, *Luther was one himself.* The Man of Sin is call'd, *Antichrist*, without Law, a *Downright Antinomian.* Jude describes them to the Life, who turn the Grace of God into Wantonness; read the whole Chapter.

Our Mechanick Preachers, who think above all Men, they pay it off, frequently tell us, *I have the Seal of my Ministry.* What a madness is this? Yet you will not allow the Church of England to bring forth a Convert and thus plead their Ministry to be of God. Paul having proved his Call, antecedently to this, rejoiceth in this.

May not a Man be converted by a Man that hath no Call, not Common Sense, an awkward way of applying every thing? Did God send that Fool?

Foolish. But I doubt, these pervert
Men did not convert them. The
Writer of the Life of Francis Sales,
Bishop, and Prince of Geneva, begins
thus; *Heaven made a rich Present to*
the World on such a day, when F. S. was
born — *He converted many Heretic*
to the Romish Faith. So these Con-
verts such;

To see Men to look, as is said of
Flavius Vespasian, as if straining at
a *Close stool*, and hear such Enuncia-
tions of the Carrion they have eaten
themselves; and corrupted others
with; to hear abominable Heresies
begotten by a weak corrupt Head, on
a vile unsanctified Heart: this may
be call'd Gospel for a little (and
but a little) while.

I still pray my Reader, if he be a
Member of the Church of England, not
to judge of our Meetings, by such
Assemblies as these I condemn. He
that would give an Account of a
Kings Palace, or of his Country
House, would not run to the House of
Office, or put his Nose over the Jaques
of a House, and describe the Air, and
all by it. Here the Dissenters Depo-

Sancti fides : I could say much of Iche
 Folly of yours ; Men I knew who
 Such a Chapter of the Prophecy of the
 Prophet Deuteronomy, and carried out
 drunk between two Men. No question
 in the Spiritual Court for his Folly or
 Prophaness. Nor of Mr. G. nigh the
 place I once lived, of whose Folly
 there is no end. I adjure you, charge
 not the Independents (tho too many
 be guilty) no more then your own
 Bishops, easie Ordination. The late
Scottish Eloquence, Presbyterians are
 so much charged with, is answered
 well by another. You will find, he
 that said (if he said it) in Prayer
 If he that provideth not for his own, be
 worse then an Infidel? What art thou
 if thou providest not for us thy People?
 Was not alone in such Folly and
 Impudence? But perhaps this Story
 may as much be questioned, as that
 one of them said, *If ever Jesus Christ*
was D. it was when he made the Lord's
Prayer, which *W. C.* twits me with
 no doubt, out of that Book. Read
 the Answer to the *Scottish Eloquence*,
 and see how some Passages are false,
 others want Proof, and Accusers guilty
 of the censured Folly.

Might

Might I not be bold to ask some Tradesman, who desire to be Preachers, to do good, as they pretend, Do you not, as *Ely's* beggarly Sons, desire to be put in the Priests Office to get a Moriel of Bread ! Conscience, What sayst thou ?

It is a heavy Charge laid on many Independents, as if they were like the old Donatist, and denied Salvation to any, but to those of their own Conventicle. Whereas he that reads Mr. Cotton, *Jeremy Burroughs*, his *Irenicum* (perhaps one of the best *Irenicums* that is) will find their Souls loathing any such Thoughts.

Neither find I the Ministers of this City (*Carolopolis*, may I call it, as *Rome* was designed, if rebuilt, to be called *Neropolis*) this way guilty. — This is but the idle Talk of the Masters of our Ceremonies : they doubt not the Salvation of Men in the Church of *England*.

Obj. Why leave they it then ?

1. Many of them were never in it, and therefore cannot strictly be said to letve it.

2. If

2. If I run from an Hospital where many die of the Spotted Fever, I run to save my self: yet I will not say they are all dead Men that are there.

3. Would I part with both or one of my Eyes, Arms, or Legs; and say, I may live and deserve the Denomination of a Man notwithstanding: This is the common, but foolish Plea. If there be *many good Christians in the Church of England*, it is good News, and we hope it is true; we are assured, there are *many more good Christians out of it*. To tell us of the *Publick Wisdom*, is Folly; they cannot hear, Who knows where it will end? We see what the *Publick Wisdom in France* hath done, and what the *Publick Wisdom* hath done in *England*, and was like to do again, had not *King James* bid us farewell.

If you were to court a Woman, who must be your second self, when you should look to her *Piety, good Nature, Skill in Domestick Affairs, and good Portion too*, Would you look only to her

her fine Dress, and Trinkets, to her Top-knots, &c.

They think you may as well make new *Credenda* as *Agenda*, and add to the *Belief*, as well as *Commandments*; and as well seek to help Christ out in his Prophetick, as Priestly Office; and that you may as well bring new Revelations, as new Injunctions.

They think it no small Sin to part with their Christian Liberty, tho the Magistrate himself should call for it: a thing *purchased* by the Blood of Christ, and that we are commanded to *stand in*. They believe the Command of not Offending the Week, &c. was not *pro tempore*, nor intended by God, till the Magistrate shall command (and swear you to) not to regard this Command of God. In Ceremonies, they think Imposition is *in God to accept*, as well as Man to offer: Bold Presumption!

They observe, That those who would make indifferent Things necessary, soon make necessary Things indifferent. If their Days be observ'd, God's Day is neglected. Lying, Swearing, Drunkenness are made no Sins, where non-observance of

of a Humane Ceremony is made a great one. They think not, you can make a thing sinful, and then damnable (if Men comply not) that was not made so by God, I ask.

Hath Bishop Davenant said less in his Book, *De fraterna Communione*. When the other Reformed Churches drove out the Pope, they let him carry all his Garments with him, but these did not. No Coalition was ever attempted between them and Rome, as between you and Rome.

Obl. Our Prayers prevent Confusion.

Think of it again: Whose Prayers are confused, yours or ours? I remember in a place where I spent some considerable time came a Tooth-Drawer for so much Money, promised one Man to give him ease, that his Teeth should never pain him more. He was as good as his word, for he made every Tooth drop out of his Head.

Lock

Doth Men up in their Chambers,
 do keep them from going out of their
 Houses, and say, It is the way to pre-
 vent Drunkenness in Taverns or Ale-
 Houses.

We are often (but weakly) told,
 how the Jews changed the Passover Por-
 ture from walking to sitting: But will
 you dare say to? the Church hath
 Power to make void God's Law, if
 to add to it. That David a King
 made great changes in God's House; not
 as a King, but as a Man of God;
 and all was done by the Command-
 ment of the Lord to him, and Nathan
 the Prophet, *1 Chroni 28. 19.* David
 had all in Hand-writing, *12 Chroni*
25. 3. Doth not the Lot signify the
 Divine Appointment, as in choosing
 Matthias in the room of Judas, *Acti*
19. 35.

Could David as a King, injoyne Po-
 sterny? But these things have been
 well replied to by others, but by none
 better (if so well) as by the ingenious
 Mr. *Asop*, in his *Melius Inquiren-*
dum.

Bring forth, you that talk of Wits,
 many of yours in one Scale, we will
 put

put this Man in another — I vindicate
his Arguments, not every Mode of
Expression.

If other Writers will not set forth
your Church in its Colours, I hope
Mr. Long's Essay hath lately done
it, or else I think it will never be
done.

For his Divinity, he hath declared
plainly, That Kneeling in the receiv-
ing the Lord's Supper, after it was
bid aside in King Edward's Days, was
taken up in Queen Elizabeth's, to sa-
tisfie the Papists, who might come to
Church and receive, owning the real
Presence. For his Politicks, he hath
lately replied to the Life of Mr. Bay-
ter, wherein that Reply hath received
the World of their Money and Time,
by printing about (as I remember)
an Hundred and fifty Pages, *verbatim*,
out of his other Book against him,
printed about 16 or 17 Years since.

What ails the Gentleman? Was
he troubled with the Hiccocks? I had
replied to it, had I not appeared a-
gainst the Book as well as he, tho' on
different Accounts. Some great Men
have said,

That.

That Mr. B's Book hath done them (that is, the King's Party) more *dis-*
chief then any Book printed for Twenty
 Years past; and that it is pity but it were
 burnt by the Hand of the Common Hang-
 man. If it were, say I, it is pity it
 should go there alone. Mr. Long, his
 Book, would be a very good Compa-
 nion for it. For,

1. He unfaints Mr. Baxter, for a
 Rebel; no Rebel, he says, can be
 one.

What Man? What then becomes
 of the Tribe of Levi now? By what
 Names or Titles soever they be now
 dignified, or distinguished? who
 with the Gentry of the Nation, invi-
 ted over our King, and took up Arms
 against King James?

Thus I affirm, is the King wound-
 ed by our Levites, who have sworn
 to him, kept Thanksgiving Days
 for their Deliverance by him. His
 Son indeed, is a Non-Juror. The
 honestest Man he, if he be of such
 corrupt Principles.

2. That

2. What may not a Penitent Rebel be saved? These Men Corrupted Mr. Baxter, and made him turn at last a Non-Resister, of which he hath to his shame, and the shame of his Friends often declar'd, and yet no Saint; He shamefully denies the Story of the Earl of *Arundel*, which Mr. *Baxter* (as well as others) hath sufficiently prov'd. May not the *Episcopate*. He hath like a poor empty Man Printed in two Books, serve some of the most Reverend Fathers: How common was it, when the Prince of *Orange* was expected daily, to go to Church in some places twice a day? And Pray for King *James*, *Grant him in Health and Wealth long to live, strengthen him, that he may vanquish and overcome all his Enemies*. And then come out. I Pray, *Is there any hope the Prince will Land, we are all undone if he do not*. And yet to the same Prayers in the Afternoon!

This Gentleman turns the wrong end of the Perspective, when he would ken Rebels that are not Saints.

I would not be mistaken, I know there are a few good, excellent, unanswer.

everable Passages in the Book, how Oliver Cromwell's Virtues were such, that it was wisht Richard might be Lick of them, &c. & yet both talk of it only in the Reliance. It was a pitiful poor Plea to Mr. Bayly. I think not the worse of Christ, Heaven, &c. Because Oliver own'd it. But I have almost forgotten my self. This is not my work now.

For my thus plain dealing in a Letter to the afore named Gentlemen. I am informed, he threatneth to do me what mischief he can, to whom I replied, I would take the first opportunity I could to do him any kindness I could. For of all Men, I was more oblig'd to him for my Conversion than kneeling, in the receiving the Sacrament more then to Rutherford's Gelasie, or Ames himself.

Whatever I have said of Mr. Baxter, I declare, I mean no more then what B. Saunderson said at the Grave. He was an illogical Piece, yet, as one told me who liv'd with him, He was the best Logician in the World. That got all out of his own Head. Mr. Baxter tells us in his Life that he call'd it, and without having a Tutor one Month.

Month all his Days studied *Aquinas*, *Occam*, *Socinus*, and *Durand*, which was able to make Giddy the strongest Head in the World, that is to say, his own. This infected him with a wrangling way of disputing, of which he sometimes was so sensible, that he caution'd some Candidates for the Ministry against it. This also made him sometimes to blunder, as when he saith, Justification was a transient Act, &c. In his last Book against *Quesada*. It is the last Plea of some Conformist,

Obj. But Nonconformist Ministers, take the bread out of our Mouths, and our People from us.

You took the bread first out of their Mouths, and their People from them; when King *Saul* took *David's* Wife from him, and gave her to *Pharai*, *David* takes her from him by the first opportunity. Let him come weeping behind; *David* cares not for that, takes his own. Yet I confess, it is pity they should take the bread out of your Mouths; tho no doubt, it could be wish't they could sometimes take.

take the Clip from some of your Mouths.

And I tell you plainly, The Dis-
senters are but half Beneficed Men
generally, and the People allow them
a poor Maintenance, to their reproach
and shame be it spoken: If they give
Forty Shilling a Year they think it
much, that can give a Thousand
Pounds or some Hundreds with a Child.
I cannot easily think they Love the
message much, that care so little for
the Messenger.

Yet in many places, they were
sent ours with their Consent, and
ours without their Consent.

I now think it convenient, having
Apologiz'd for many Congregational
Men, so now for some Anabaptist
against the Charge of Antinomianism,
Countenancing Trade, &c. Prea-
ching, &c. That there are Learned
Anabaptists in the City, and Reverend
Divines cannot be denied. Mr. Stone
seven Year as I remember an Oxon-
ian. Mr. Collins, Mr. Harrison, and o-
thers, who are Masters of their
work. Some that are no Scholars
but yet studious Men. Preach and
Discourse well, and such Conformists
and

and Presbyterians themselves some-
times admit, tho I think it should be
done very sparingly. Let such Preach
the Gospel who can defend it against
Existence, Socinians, Deists, and
others; I remember, He that wrote a
Book call'd, *The Present State of Hol-
land*, commends the *Anabaptists* there
for their peaceable behaviour, and
good sound Doctrine, some here I am
sure, deserve the like Commenda-
tion.

Some of these bewail what they
cannot help. The Preaching of
many ignorant conceited Men among
them. How can they Analyse, they
know not what an Analysis is. Mr.
Delaware his Tongue, hath done
much ill, no small mischief, who
can read, but cannot understand.
What hath such to do with a Figure,
what the learned Call *Synecdoche*,
now mentioning that *Circum-
stance*. I have an opportunity to let
the World, that tho once a *Pope*,
he was indeed a *Protestant*; of him I
had a large and true Account from an
once his Scholar. When he was
Pope in *Ireland*, he would often read
the Scripture, and when inclinable

Change, he accidentally liv'd in the House of an *Anabaptist*, which occasion'd his being such himself.

This sort of Men here shame some others, who more Friendly converse together, then other Contenders do. Their Coffee-House is like *Noahs* Ark, as I have often told them; where are, as to Principles in Doctrine, Clean and Unclean Beasts, Calvinists, and Arminians, and Antinomians too, Singers, and Anti-singers. Some for free Communicating, others against it. Not but that it could be wish'd that their Friendships were greater, and that in their Polemicals, they would more forbear Personal Reflections.

DIALOGUE
BETWEEN
A Wild Crispian and a
Sober Christian.

W. I Am glad to see you, my good Brother.

C. I understand not your Salutation, for I look not on you as Brother, but as an Enemy to me, and to my Lord Christ.

W. O you are greatly mistaken in me, I doubt you do not know me; for I am known to talk of nothing, more than Christ exalted.

C. Yes, and to do nothing more than to debase him, and what you call to Dethrone him, you take him

E

in

(96)
in one Office; I in all three, as Prophet, and King, as well as Priest.

Cp. Why, Man, if you oblige Providence, my very Name may be my Apology, for my Name is *Crispian*, which is, much like *Christian*.

Ct. Yes, but you know every like is not the same. If you would be witty indeed, it might rather prove you to be but a *half Christian*. Is not *Crispian* in the Name, *Anti-Christ*. *Jesús*, in the Name *Jesús*, which is more. But what think you, if I mention the same Name in Scripture, for that that is most opposite?

Cp. I pray what is that?

Ct. What think you of the Name *God*, is it not the Name of the most High, Holy, Glorious Being. The Maker of all, our Benefactor in this and every way?

Cp. But what then?

Ct. Yet is this Name given to the Devil. (in Name *ab officio*, as well as *natura*) the Hater of the most High, the Murderer of Souls, the cursed Creature that is. Yet he is call'd, *God of the World*.

Ct. Come then, Let us go from Names to Things. I doubt you

one of them that assert, The Conditionality of the Covenant of Grace with Believers, and of Perseverance unto salvation.

Cr. No, I am not, but am well satisfied in what the truly Eagle Ey'd Man, Mr. *Capel* hath said against it, in a little thing worth Gold, bound up with his Book of *Temptations*. Yet, all that assert Perseverance are, and must be found in sense, whether in Phrases or no.

Cr. What is your apprehensions about it?

Cr. That the word, we render Covenant, *διαθήκη*, is rendred Testament, *Mat.* 26. 28. And we call the Bible, *The Old and New Testament*.

2. That the word Covenant as we render it in Scripture, must not imply a Condition as some read, *Gen.* 9. 9, 10, 11, 12. Gods Covenant not to destroy all Flesh, admits of no condition, yet of a Sign the Rainbow, and that Gods Covenant of Grace with Man, is like this Covenant, is evidenced by *Isaiah*. *As I have Sworn, the*

E. 2

Wa-

(98)
Waters of Noah shall no more return to
drown the Earth, &c.

3. Heb. 8. 10. Where the Cove-
nant is mention'd, it is a promise of
Grace, for I cannot for my heart con-
ceive, How a thing should be the ma-
ter of a promise and condition of it
too. Or a thing be the condition of
it self.

4. God gives the Sign of this to all
his own, many ways if you will so
call it.

5. I therefore take what some call
Conditions to be, not properly but
improperly so, they are necessary
Consequents of Justification, and ne-
cessary Antecedents to Glorifica-
tion.

Q. Oh Sir, I am pleas'd to the
Heart to hear you talk so Orthodox-
ly. I suppose you are a Calvinist, and
some say, Calvin and Dr. Cyp are
agreed.

A. Yes, I am as surely a Prote-
stant, for (that is the right Name) as
you are none: But they that tell you,
Those two are one, may as soon Re-
con-

concile God and Satan.

Cp. Good Sir, some more sound Doctrine; I hope, you do not own *Previous* or *Preparatory Qualifications* to true Grace some Men talk of.

Ct. Yes, I do, and yet do not. I am of their Opinion, and yours too in this point.

Cp. This is strange, and seems impossible, I pray explain your self.

Ct. Mr. Norton in his Orthodox Evangelist spends, I confess, too much time about this thing, and it is the greatest, if not only, flaw in that sound Learned Book: I believe with them it is Gods, if not frequent or common, yet sometimes way and work, and experience proves it; but I believe with you, it is not his constant work. As when Three Thousand were prickt to the Heart, immediately converted and baptiz'd. I doubt not, but the greatest Adulterers, Swearers, Drunkards, that sit down unconverted, profane hearers, sometimes arise Converted, Pardoned ones: God suddenly touching and turning their wills. And the Kingdom of Heaven is as a Grain of Mustard-seed, the least

of all Grains, Yet grows up to a great Tree, that the Birds of the Air lodge in the Branches of it.

The greatest Oak was once an Acorn, and the greatest Giant once an Infant crying in the Cradle, and the greatest Schollar once learning his Letters.

Ep. I hope, you own the Elect were ever beloved, when in the highth of all their wickedness; and that God hath no more to lay to their charge, then to the charge of any Saint in Heaven. p. 368.

Cr. No, by no means, for the Scriptures say plainly, Rom. 9. 25, 26, 24, 25, 26. There was the Love of purpose or good will, for they are said to be prepared unto Glory, then call'd both Jews and Gentiles, then the People which were not a People, and not beloved, which was not beloved. And they which were not any People, are call'd the Children of God, in the same place shall it be said, &c. Can words be plainer? Yet you say, they were ever beloved, ever a People, ever the Children of God. Where God is said to Love with an everlasting Love, a priori, it is of purpose or good will a posteri-

ori,

it is with Complacency and so be-
loved.

Cp. I grant indeed, God delighted
not in their Sins, but Persons.

Ct. O rare discovery! Now you
think you have hit it, and stop our
Months.

1. I am glad you are not yet come
so far as to say, God loves their
Sins.

2. But the strain of Scripture is
Gods hating the wicked, not their
wickedness, that they are Enemies
&c.

3. So God hateth the Sins of the
Elect after Conversion, as well as be-
fore; and if no more was meant then
hating their Sins, God might (say I)
be said as truly to hate them after Con-
version, as before.

Cp. But doth not God Love them
as his Creatures?

Ct. Yes, and so he doth the Non-
elect, and if you please, you may
say the Devils themselves, what
is that to our purpose?

C^p. I could bring you good Authors that thus assert.

C^t. Yes, just as Colonel Darter would meddle openly with Divine work; who citing the *Magdalenian* History about Baptism, mentioning a place, where they were said to *confess* Sin when baptized. Hence drew this Inference;

They knew nothing of *Infant-Baptism*, for *Infants* could not *confess* Sin, when the next Words prove, they baptized *Infants*. *Nisi propter statum loqui non poterant*. What shall we call this?

So is it as false, That the old *Waldenses* were against *Infant-baptism*; the *Papist* charged them so, they not baptizing their Children sometimes so soon as they; they sometimes wanting an Administrator, their Preachers being abroad: For *Perin*, who wrote the best History of them, tells us these words in their Confession of Faith, and Catechism; *and for this reason we baptize Infants*.

The learnedst Anabaptist once in *England* told me, he advised the Colonel to confess this Fault; and that he replied, *No, I will do as Mr. Baxter,*

ter, when a thing is out, make the best of it. But where did Mr. B. so grossly corrupt History? I am sure, my Lord Lambert, when he heard of the Book, and, Had Mrs. Danvers wrote a Book on that Subject, he had not wondered, but thought him unfit for it. But by such ungodly Tricks and Cheats he made many go down into the Water; he had his end, and that was enough. Mr. Tombs and my Lord Laurence took so such base Methods: yet, I grant a very few, not many, seem to say what you plead.

Cy. Return then to the Scriptures.

Cr. He that believeth in him, is not condemned, but he that believeth not, is condemned already, 1 John 3. Are not they Sons, Children of God, by Adoption; How then before I are you dream not as yet of an Eternal Adoption, 1 Cor. 6. 11.

He shews they were not justified before: Such were some of you, 16 Acts 18. They are turned from Satan to God, that they might receive Remission of Sin. The Doctors Story of the Deer-stealer, and such nasty Comparisons;

D⁵

Having

Flouring a Knife in thy Flank to cut the Throat of Christ, are loathsome. And that I may appear impartially, it was bad in Dr. Twisse, to say, God could not be such a Fool — As in Parker, to say an Almighty D. Or Twisse again, *As we cut the Throats of Devils for our pleasure,* &c. &c.

Cp. You say we are justified by Faith, we say freely without it; and Beza puts the Point, at the end of *Justified*, 3 Rom. 15, being justified, by Faith we have Peace with God.

But the Stream of the Chapter proves our reading — and other places, 3 Rom. 20, 28, 30. Therefore we conclude a Man is justified by Faith without the Deeds of the Law. He justifieth the Circumcision by Faith, and Uncircumcision through Faith; if we have by Faith, Peace with God, is not this what you will not always grant?

Cp. But is not a Sinner, as a Sinner justified and pardoned? sure you will not deny this.

Ct. Sure I will deny it. *A Quare- nus ad omne valet consequentia:* then would every Sinner be justified and pardoned, for all Men are such. It

is the *believing* Sinner that is justified,
the *repenting* Sinner that is pardon-
ed.

Cp. But we are grossly belyed. As
if we made our selves the Subjects of
Christ's *Mediatorial Righteousness*.

Cs. Your Adversary did not say it
plainly, but thought it the Conse-
quence of your Doctrine; tho I wish
he had let it alone, seeing you are ir-
reconcilable about it.

Cp. Well, Man is in no Sense ju-
stified by Works; it is meer Popery,
I expect no such thing.

Cs. I believe we may think you are
no Papist; you think not to be saved
by good works, for none do you do.
Good, Was not Abraham justified by
Works, when he offered up Isaac on the
Altar, 2 James 21. 25? Was not
Rahab justified by Works, when she re-
ceived the Spies? So that, saith James,
Man is justified by Works, and not by
Faith only, 24. ver.

Cp. But Luther called this Epistle
the Strawy one; and said, *Flumen non
justificatur ex operibus in delirio Jaco-*

bus. *Quemadmodum flumen non justificatur
ex operibus in delirio Jacobi.* On which

to Mr. Whether *Luther* continued in that mind, I know not. The Learned *Whitaker* proves against this Charge of the Papist, many of the Ancients, not accounted Hereticks, denied this Epistle. And *Willet*, as I remember, in his *Synopsis*, proves the same, this was therefore *Luther's* Error. Man is justified declaratively before Men. *Show me thy Faith without thy Works, I will shew thee my Faith by my Works.* 18. verse 22. Faith wrought with his Works, not his Works with his Faith. As the Body, v. 26. *sepis, vivum est, without the Breath is dead, so Faith without Works is dead also.*

The breath maketh not Man alive, but proves him so. They who plead for a Faith that worketh not, are a scandal to the Protestant Religion. *James* describes Religion from its Defects, 1. *James* 27. Pure Religion is to visit Fatherless, &c. having to do with the Libertines, or right Antinomians of that Age. Dr. *Tully* hath proved well, that there is a declarative Justification; 1. *Coram hominibus*, 2. *Coram Angelis*, 3. *Coram ipso Deo*.

Hereby I know thou fearest God, 22. *Gen* 12. God knew it sure before,

love; but Abraham gave another Proof
of it before God.

This is evident; was not the first
Act of Justification, that was long
before.

C. I cannot get over what you said
before, in Rom. 23. 24. Tho. they
were not beloved yet God might Love
them before they were called; or
they might be loved, tho. not called
Beloved. For spiritual love is given.

C. Beloved is passive, as Love is
active. You say, I think, that they were not be-
loved, tho. they were not be-
loved yet God might love them; will
not hold here; and to say, God called
them beloved, pray mind the next
Words, Who were not beloved? not,
Who were not called beloved?

Yet, according to you, they were
called beloved. Jacob have I loved
before, tho. when God called love them;
that is, Sin, before Conversion, 2 Ep. 1.

It is plainly said, but it was not
a complacential Love, as I named be-
fore, but with a Love of purpose or
good will.

C. But you make Obedience, good
works, the way to the Kingdom, when
Christ is the way, the truth, and the life.
You ask for Life, &c. So.

Ch So Old Protestants before us plead
 that of *Austin* against the *Papists*,
Bona opera sunt via ad regnum, non
causa regnandi: as they did another
 Saying of his, *Bona opera non præce-*
dunt justificationem sed sequuntur justifica-
tionem. How often read you in Scrip-
 ture such Phrases? it may be Secret of
 Times in one *Psalms*, 119. *The path*
of thy Commandments—The way of thy
Precepts, &c Is there no Truth but
 Christ? No Life but Christ? Some-
 times you say, Christ is not in our
 Sermons—It may be; his Name is not
 in the Text, in the Chapter, Will
 you tare them out of the Bible? For
selling for Self, sure if you think it a
 Weakness in *Moses*, to have an Eye
 to the Recompence of Reward; do
 you think it so in Christ? who, for
 the Joy that was set before him endured
 the Cross, 12 Heb. 2. Mr. G. *Finnis*, in that
 admirable piece, *The real Christian*, hath
 by the way, corrected the Errors of
 some other men besides you, that call
 this *self love*, and hath proved that the
Philartia, or *self-love*, condemn'd in Scrip-
 ture, is sensual self; & that this *self-love*
 we speak of, are we prest to in Scripture.
 Thou mayst call thy self Christian; but
 C. will call thee *worker of iniquity*.

I may say to such of you, that talk of being the best Christians, what Sp. Times says, in his Apology about the Popes being Peters Successor.

In qua re, in qua functione, in qua parte vite illi successit? Quid enim unquam, aut Petrus, Pape, aut Papa Petro simile habuit? So say I in what thing, in what work, in what part of thy Life followest thou Christ? For wherein was Christ like thee, or thou like him? Is this true, *Without Holiness no Man shall see the Lord, &c.* But tell me in short, what is your Opinion.

Cy. I have given the *Ecce* without any change in me, I believe my Sins are forgiven me, that they are not mine but Christs, he hath obeyed for me, if I sin this contents me, I am never sad about it. I never confess sin when in a good frame, nor beg Pardon of God, for I know my sins were forgiven before committed.

Cy. I think you read not many Books, no not the Bible, but one Book I am sure you, and all your Brethren have read.

Cy. What

Cp. What Book is that I Pray, you are so confident of?

Ct. Your *Horn-book*, and there you learnt, *Forgive us our Trespases*. — Well, if you minded, *Hollowed be thy Name, thy will be done on Earth*. Tho I believe well of some call'd *Anonymus* (and too deservedly) they are upright in the main, yet as for you, and such as you, you are some of the *Eldest Sons the Devil hath*. Not confess *Sin*, nor beg *Pardon*? Words one would think, too big for the Mouth of the Devil.

Cp. I Pray, have you read Dr. *Crisp's* book throughout? It is the best Book in the World, I dare defend it.

Ct. No I read it not all, I was Sick to read so much.

Cp. This it is to censure a Book, and not read all.

Ct. You I doubt censure Books you read none of. And some of them that put their hands to the Book, I hear confess, they read it not over, which is worse: But you that are so hot, Did you ever read it over?

Cp. I little thought you would ask me that Question. But I will not lye,

for, I confess, I never read one quarter of the book over, yet I doubt not all is sound.

Ci. I am glad you would not tell a Lye, nor look on it as a part of your *Christian Liberty*, but if you had committed such a small sin, you would not have added a greater to be troubled for it.

Cp. No, for I am not the Lyar, for Dr. Crisp well observes, *Thou art not the Idolater or Thief.* So I not the Lyar, then the Doct. speaketh very comfortably, *Sin can do me no harm*; And that after the greatest Sins I could commit, I must as certainly conclude, I am pardon'd before any Humiliation, as after, say what you will, he was the most Gospel Preacher in the World.

Ci. You will find somewhat else is to be minded besides Comfort. Your Gospel you know, is a *Lawless Gospel*: And I declare, I never heard an Antinomian Sermon in my days, till I heard the Reverend *Linen-Draper*. When *Heresy* and *Nonsense*, and *Impudence* seem'd to contend, which should make him most infamous.

Cp. But

Cp. But what have you to say against Dr. Crisp? All the world shall not convince me, but he was a very Good Man.

Ct. Who denies he was? Or if it might be denyed, It is in vain to attempt it, to a Man resolv'd never to believe it. Have I not said enough already, why I am displeas'd with him?

See what woful work he makes of Faiths being an *Ecce*, 492, 296.

Cp. But I am angry with them that say, *Men are not justified till they believe, and that Faith is the Uniting Grace when it follows Union*, John 15. Confounds you all.

Ct. Were the Controversy about a Priority of Nature, I would not contend. Our Act of Faith, and Gods Act of justifying are coeval and instantaneous Acts; but it is a Priority of time you plead for; from *Eternity*, from the *Womb*, in the *hight* of *all* *wickedness*.

You must know, there is a great difference between *Uniting* and *Union*, as is between *Marrying* and *Married*.

Cp. What

Cp. What more displeaseth you?

Ct. That tho Christ sayeth, *My Father loveth me, because I lay down my life for my sheep.* Yet the Doctor talks of his being *separate from God, alien to him, as sin being on him.* I know not how, more then by imputation sure. Doth the Judge hate a substitute punisht for anothers fault? (*Volenti non fit injuria*, by the way he may so punish) Doth he hate him as the actual Murtherer, Traytor, Thief, &c. Also he talkt at a wild rate, of *Pouring Physick down the throat.* Dr. Prosper, says well, *Voluntas in tantum libera in quantum liberata.* And we all say, *acta agit, mota movit.* & *fructus a Deo conversa convertit se ad Deum.* And his Sixteenth Sermon against Evidences is intolerable: Sin doth no hurt, Duties no good, &c.

Cp. But you tell Men they should be troubled for Sin, even Believers for their falls and faults.

Ct. Why was not *David* so? Was not sin his burthen?

Cp. What *David* did he did of himself, and he erred as when he said, hath the Lord forgotten to be Gracious, &c?

Ct. Hold

CL. Hold thou thy Tongue, thou Blasphemous Corrupter of Scripture. I think not this thy bold impudent assertion worth Confutation. We thou might lose the best of *Psalms*, the Penitential *Psalms*, *Psal.* 51. Sinned *Peter* when he went out and wept bitterly. Or the three Thousand when pricked at the heart by *Peters* Sermon?

As in the natural birth, there is no bringing forth without pain, tho not in all alike, so in the Spiritual Birth. If a child cry not when born, a cry is in the Room it is a dead Child. Apply, if you as you will.

Q. If Doct. *Crisp* said this, hath he not one word to the contrary?

CL. Not that I know, if he hath his Book is like *Mahomet's* Bull; one Horn of Fire, the other of Snow. It is so about sanctification, evidencing and not evidencing justification; wonder how the Sermons can agree to lie together. That they do not fight one with another. They wanted a good Binder to make them quiet. Had the Publishers a mind to let the World know, that as *Tobias* and *Crisp* could not agree with Protestant Divines of all persuasions, so they could

not.

many times agree between themselves? Let him go say I, and his followers after him, with his Apocryphal Writings, and mind you that famous place. *Zobit* went out and his Dog follow'd him.

Cp. But Doct. *Crisp* was an honest

Man. Cr. If his followers be, or should be never so bad.

Cp. You may as well say, *Epicurus* was a sober Man (and I declare, I look on his own Morals to be some of the best I ever read) tho his followers call'd *Epicureans* from him, were *Pyrrhonian Philosophers*, and at last downright *Ranters*.

Cp. But Doct. *Crisp* intended not to teach Men to be prophane.

Cr. Neither did *Epicurus* any more than he. Who thought Virtue not to be the *summum bonum*, there being a good beyond it, and that it was not desired as an end, but as a means to an end, *Pleasure*. His followers had enough to have this granted, that pleasure was the chief good, and therefore placed it in sensuality (having no love to virtue) and cited some of *Epicurus's* his loose, careless, extravagant passages (not half so bad as Dr. *Crisp's* by

by the way) I averre many *Crisp* now do the like of their Master, and will not many more within a few Years, all Ranters once again get the Ascendant in England?

The Name of *Epicurus* was odious to all sober Philosophers, for laying such a Foundation for all manner of Abominations, so will *Crisp* Name be (and indeed already is) to pious devout, serious Christians.

Q. But what do some *Atheists* say of the close of all our Breaches, What will here is about Religion, &c.

A. So there is about every thing else.

About Government, Civil Liberty, Law, *Physick*, *Medicine* and *Taxation*. A saying of Mr. Baxter in a Multitude of his Books, I have valued as Gold, *The Church is a Hospital of diseased Souls*. And that no more piety and kindness is going among us in our Controversies, is to be bewail'd. It is a shame any Prophane Men should say Come, Let us not fall out as the Saints do: not to be reconcil'd. I have often said, when I wrote my *Vindication* and since, were he against whom I wrote, alive; I would visit him, if he would

would accept it. But indeed, if after
 a fair method of Conviction, or Love,
 we be desperate, will not speak, &c.
 I am as fit for them, as a crooked
 death for a crooked knife.

Having brought in the Independents,
 I am not guilty, as to the Charge of
 many against them, as if *Crispian*
 when to my Knowledge few are
 such, or none abroad could I see or
 hear of, where Providence hath call'd
 me. And in *London* (where there are
 some that look that way) are many
 leathers of it: I go on, to justify them
 farther against their Non-comply-
 ance with the Publick Worship, as
 some other Dissenters occasionally do:
 Who lay up some Principles as we
 do, old thredbare (perhaps patch)
 Coats and Cloaks, against a Tempe-
 stuous Stormy or Snowy Day; some
 are pleas'd to call those that withdraw
 from the Liturgy, and Sacrament
Schismatics, and what they please, I
 shall not proceed in that way, I might,
 had I not lately accepted of a fair
 debate about Liturgies, Ceremonies,
 and

and Conformity, with a Worshipping
Learned, Devout, and Pious Church-
man, between him and me the Con-
troverſy was begun, continued, and
ended, not in the London way and
manner, with reviling, hatred, and
fables, but in the Old Chriſtian
way and manner, with the Spirit
of Meekneſs and Love. I do Preſent
his Letter with his Conſent, I add
this as a ſupplement to what I have
ſaid before, for their juſtification in
this reſpect.

And in London (where there are
ſome that look that way) are many
teachers of it: I go out to viſit them
rather againſt their Non-comply-
ance with the Popiſh Worſhip, as
ſome other Diſſenters do: I do
lay up ſome Principles as we
do old Chriſtians (perhaps ſome
do not and others, againſt a ſome
ſerious Stormy or Snowy Day, ſome
are pleaſed to call that that with ſtrive
from the Liberty, and Sacrament
of the Church, and what they pleaſe, I
will not proceed in that way I might
not lately accepted of a fair
and about ſundry Ceremonies,
and

P A P E R

Sent by a

CONFORMIST

TO A

Nonconformist.

NO Church can appoint means of Grace, but may appoint Ceremonies and Liturgies, and other Forms of Worship.

2. By means of Grace, I mean such things or Actions, to the due performance of which any promise of Grace Ghostly or Bodily, is Annexed by God. As to the Sacrament of

F Baptism

Baptism and the Lords Supper,
Prayer, Preaching, and other means
of Gods Institution.

3. Helps to Devotion, as to Time
Place, Order, Forms, &c. Are not
this Rank, but may be appointed by
any Church.

4. This is the difference between
our Ceremonies, and the Church of
Romes Institutions. For Example
Holy Water is with them, said to
have Virtue, to chase away Devils
to help Women in Child-bed, to avert
Storms, &c. But we say, not the
wearing of a Surplice for Example
or any other of our Ceremonies have
any Virtue at all in themselves, or by
their Institution to confer any, either
Ghostly or Bodily Grace, but only
a Decency or Order in the Worship
which God hath Commanded, and
such Order and Decency she hath
ever had Power to appoint, but never
any means of Grace. Nor doth our
Church ascribe any such Power to
herself.

THE NONCONS ANSWER.

It seems to me, unlawful for any Church to impose on Ministers of the Gospel, any Liturgy to be us'd in publick Administrations, especially so defective a one as the *English* Liturgy, for these Reasons.

1. Because in the infancy of the Church, in its Nonage, when God taught it by many Rituals, till it came to maturity, or full Age as a Man, he appointed no Forms of Prayer then to be said, much less read. It cannot be supposed, but the Priests in their Sacrifices and other Administrations, as they taught the People

F 2

the

the signification and use of them, and so were as the Mouth of God to them, so they solemnly Pray'd to God, as the Mouth of the People to him. Now if God then made no Prayer Book for them, who dares impose one now on the Ministers of the Gospel, a better Ministration or Dispensation?

2. Because they tend to the weakening of Ministerial Abilities this way, and seem to be contrary to the Apostles Command, *Stir up the Gifts God in thee.* He that officiates, is suppos'd to have Gifts fit for his work. If he hath, he must use them; if he hath not, what hath he to do with that office? What is a Physician or Lawyer, if unable to speak aptly to, or for his Patient or Client.

3. Because the same Prayers suited to some Emergencies, or occasions cannot be to all. New Sins, New Judgments, New Temptations, New Providences, New Mercys require for particular Confessions, Deprecations, Petitions, Praises, &c. That old set Forms will not serve for.

4. Reading

1. Be
teach th
redm

4. Reading Prayers to God, we read nothing of in Scripture, or among the Ancients. This hinders Devotion when the Eyes are nail'd on a Book, that should be so to Heaven.

5. The Common Prayer Book seems to be full of Incoherencies, and Tautologies, unwarrantable Repetitions by the People, who in Church Stated Worship were to say (ordinarily) no more then *Amen*, or what is equivalent to it. Womens Weeping also is (ordinarily) forbidden, except in Singing *Psalms*, which *Joseph Mead*, and Others think is meant by the word *Prophecie*. Here the Lords Prayer is said over, soon after again; the King prayed for, after other Petitions he is prayed for again, then the Lord's Prayer again, after the King again, and so on.

Symbolical Ceremonies in Divine Worship ought not to be impos'd, much less yours, for these Reasons.

1. Because, when it pleased God to teach the Church this way, by Ceremonies

monies, he made them himself. [Mose
(of all Men most dear to God) was not
intrusted to make one of them, much
less Aaron, or the Civil Governours,

2. It cannot be rationally imagin'd,
that God intended to lay aside Cere-
monies of Divine Appointment, to
make way for Ceremonies of Hu-
man Appointment. May Circumci-
sion now be used, if Appointed
only as Commemorative; or Signi-
ficant of Circumcising the Heart? Or
might a Lamb be slain to put in mind
of Christ slain, if injoyn'd by the
Church or Magistrate, tho' not as an
Ordinance of God, or means of Grace
to work any Ghostly or Spiritual
Good, as promis'd by God? Might
sprinkling with Holy-water be thus
us'd, as only signifying the washing
away of Sin, if thus injoyn'd.

3. Surplice and Cross are made of
Lay-mens Books, by putting in re-
membrance by some notable Sign to
Edifie, &c. great Vertue is ascrib'd
to the last. The Cross is not only
Symbolical, but Dedicatory.

It is no Sign between one Church-
Member

Member and another, but between him and God. By this Sign is the Child said to be Dedicated to the Service of him that Dyed upon the Cross. Who may be so bold to make Signs of this Nature to God?

4. They seem contrary to the Apostles command, *Let all things be done decently, and in order.* I would desire no better Text against them then this you all urge for them. What a Phantastical Dress doth a Surplice seem to be, unbecoming the Gravity of a Gospel Minister?

Can it be suppos'd the Apostle who laid down this Golden Rule, used any of your Ceremonies, or such as yours? How comes your Decency to be us'd in the Desk, and to be laid aside when you ascend the Pulpit? Is God to be worshipped with Decency in the one, and without it in the other.

Doth not the Apostle Censure Women Speaking, Singing diverse *Psalms* together, which were not things decent, or things done in order?

The Decency injoyn'd by *Paul* was such as the Law of God, and Nature requir'd,

requir'd as agreeable to them, and therefore was Antecedently necessary to his Injunction and Practice.

5. Things necessary in *Genera* may be determin'd by Human Authority, what they shall be in *Specie*, as Time, Place, &c. but not what is not so, or thus necessary, as Sacred Vestments, or Accessory signs, to signs of Divine Appointment.

THE

THE Con's Return.

YOU have not answered my Argument, *viz.* That the Church may impose Ceremonies, Liturgies, &c. or any thing short of Means of Grace, which none can appoint but God.

Instead of confessing or denying this, you fall immediately to several Instances.

But let us first agree upon the Reason of the Thing in general, before we descend to particulars. But now to the Instances;

The First is, as to Liturgies, which you make to be unlawful, for these Reasons,

I. Be-

1. Because God appointed no Forms of Prayer for them (the Jews) to be said, much less read.

Answer 1. If the Church hath Power to impose Forms of Prayer, she is also judge of the time when to impose them.

Therefore, They were not imposed then, is no Argument why they may not be imposed now.

Or, That God did not impose them, is no Argument why the Church may not, if he hath given her that Power. Therefore all still recurs on the Power of the Church, for that must Govern all the particular Instances, but the Instances cannot determine that..

Answer 2. God did impose Forms of Prayer to the Jews, as upon Offering the first fruits, Deut. 26. 5, &c. On the removal of the Ark, Num. 10. 35. and several other occasions. Moses's Song, Deut. 32. was to be continually used. And the Psalms were of daily use in the Temple, and were imposed, as a Form by *Hezekiah*, 2 Chr.

19.
Jofia
Baby
tho
Soler
and
Dan
their
was
like
cord
Circ
tho
only
Pfal
was
two
wh
wh
wh
15
hall
2
ha
no
C
of
ic

19. as *Jeremiab's Lamentation upon Josiah*, Chap. 35. 25, The Jews in *Babylon*, sent a Form of Prayer to those in *Jerusalem*, to be read in their Solemn Worship, *Bar. 1. 14. 14. &c.* and that was taken out of that Form, *Dan. 9.* with Additions respecting their present case. The 136 *Psalms*, was a usual Form of Thanksgiving, like the *Te Deum* now in use: and accordingly we find the *Psalms* used, *2 Chron. 5. 13. 7. 3. 20. 21. Ezra 3. 2.* and tho the Repetition of each Verse is only named, it was the Name of the *Psalms*; as when we say, the *Te Deum* was sung, the meaning is not, Those two Words only, but the whole Hymn, which is so called from those Words which are in it. And that Form, whose Title is mentioned *Numb. 10. 35.* was repeated; and more of it told by *David*, *Psalms 132. 8.* And again in the same Words by *Solomon*, *2 Chron. 6. 41.*

As the Jews always had, they still have a Liturgy. *George Keith* can help you to the sight of one; and if your Curiosity leads you to speak with any of them, of their use of it, how long it hath been with them, &c.

But

But Lastly. Since Schism is a great Sin confest on all hands, nothing can excuse our running into Schism, but the Imposition of what it plainly and positively a Sin.

Therefore it lies on you to prove,

1. That a Liturgy is unlawful.
Or,

2. That Men may run into Schism to avoid what is not unlawful.

This brings the Matter to a short Issue, and will make my Answer very short to the other Reasons, which are at most but Inconveniencies, and therefore not sufficient Causes for Schism.

The second Reason you urge is, That it weakneth Ministers Abilities.

Answer. No, there is liberty given to stir up the Gift in his own Prayer unprescribed, before and after Sermon, and upon several other occasions. This is no sufficient Cause for Schism.

3d Rea-

3d Reason you give, is that in the Liturgy; There are not Prayers suited for all Emergencies.

Answer 1. These may be supplied in the Ministers Prayer, which is not prescribed.

2. Particular Offices are made for extraordinary Occasions.

3. Most ordinary Occasions are provided for in the Liturgy; as Plague, War, Famine, Rain, Drought, &c.

This is no sufficient Cause for Schism.

Your 4th Reason is, That we read not of Liturgies, or Forms in Scripture, or among the Ancients, and that it hinders Devotion.

Answer. The first part of this Reason is answered above; That we do read it both in Scripture, and amongst the Ancients.

As to the Second. That it hinders Devotion. It may be so at first to Persons prejudic'd, or unaccustom'd.

But

But the Experience of others doth witness, that it is a great help to Devotion to them, and much more moving than Extemporary Effusions, (that are as much a Form to the Hearers,) but however the Debate goes, this is no sufficient cause for Schism, unless it were positively forbidden in Scripture.

Your fifth Reason objects something to be mended in the Form of our Liturgy, pretended Incoherencies, Tautologies, Repetitions: If all which were granted, are no cause for Schism. And such Objections might be made against the 136 *Psalm*, where are more Repetitions, than any in our Liturgy. But Repetitions are often found in the Extemporary way.

But however this be determin'd, there is no sufficient cause for Schism, for that is the Point which I pursue.

The Second Branch of your Paper is, That Symbolical Ceremonies in Divine Worship ought not to be impos'd.

But before I come to the Reasons, let me premise this, That there are many

many things, which ought not to be in Prudence imposed, and yet when imposed, are not a sufficient Ground for Schism.

Now to the Reasons.

To the first *three*, I Answer. Are not Feasts, and Fasts, Symbolical things? For this reason they deny to the Church power to impose them, at least Annually. Now the Feast of *Purim*, *Ester* 9. 27; The fasts of *the fifth, and the seventh months*. *Zach.* 4. 5. And the feast of the Dedication, *1. Macc.* 1. 59. were Ordain'd by the Church, and Annually; and our Saviour honour'd the last with His Presence, *Job.* 10. 12. Which had it been unlawful, he would not have done, but rather have Reproved it.

Again, Circumcision was appointed for an initiating Sign or Right. The Jews added Baptism long before Christ came, and they Baptized as well as Circumcised their Proselytes. But our Saviour found no fault with this: Nay, on the contrary, He went on with and continued it; *John* was sent to Baptize: and Christ appointed Baptism for the initiating Form of his Church. The Jews addition

dition of Baptism was more Symbolical, and Dedicating, than you can Alledge upon the Cross in Baptism, especially, considering that we make it not Essential to Baptism, which is demonstrated, in that it is not to be used in the Office of Private Baptism.

Your fourth Reason, That a Surplice is a Phantastical Dress, and unbecoming the Gravity of a Gospel Minister, is *Gravis dictum*. Every Country is Master of its own Fashions and Dresses, and that is unbecoming, and indecent in one Country, that is not so in another, which is becoming and decent in another.

There is nothing in Nature to make White more than Black, or Black more than White to be decent, or indecent. If you say there is, you lay more stress upon Colours than we do, and so will fall into the same Superstition, you accuse us with.

Secondly. It is hard to call that colour Phantastical, which God himself appointed to the Priests under the Law: And wherein Angels appeared, and Christ himself in His Transfiguration: Or to say, It is unbecoming the Gravity of a Gospel Preacher, or Minister.

You

Your fifth Reason. That things necessary in *Genere*, may be determined in *Specie* by Human Authority, doth justifie our practise in this, for we do no more. Vestments are necessary in *Genere*, the colour, or shape of them is no other then the determining of them in *Specie*, and unless you can shew a positive Prohibition against the wearing of White, it is as lawful as Black, or any other Colour. However, without such a Prohibition, whatever Opinion, or Fancy you or I may have as to the Decency of it, there can be no Ground upon this Account for Schism, or for us to make Rents in the Church, which is a tearing of Christ's Body to pieces.

A few Hours after the *Noncon* sent him the following Reply.

THAT Arguments are not answer'd, is a common Complaint, and often where there is least occasion, you think, I have not answered yours, I think I have, you think, (no doubt,) you now have answered mine; perhaps, I think, you have not; every thing of our own generally appears to us great, tho never
for

so little; and every thing of others against us, appears little, tho never so great. I therefore care not for words of that nature.

If the Church can impose any thing short of what you call means of Grace. It might impose Circumcision, Holy Water for a Symbolical Sign, only as I wrote. Such Repetitions, you know are tedious.

I did deny plainly your Position, and am ready for more proof. You then produced not your Arguments for your Assertion, which now you do, and I thought it not Civility in me to Anticipate them.

The Church of the Jews had no power to impose Liturgies, or Ceremonies under the Law. God somewhere forbad the making of the like by the art of the Apothecary, &c. (I have no Concordance by me.) He charged them not to add, as not to diminish. Therefore the Church hath no power now. Where is her Charter? If God saw it not fit to make Prayers for the Priests, to be read by them, but they Prayed according to the Ability God gave them. He sees it not fit to do it now: when greater

greater Abilities are given to Gospel Ministers now than to them of the Tribe of Levi. More Knowledge to Christians now, than to the Jews then. The Veil is taken away.

The Question was of imposed Forms to be read by the Priests; and you answer to a Declaration made by a private Person. *Deu. 26. 5.* Do you think indeed they were tyed to Words or Sense? or that they took out a Paper or Prayer Book, and read. I use the word *Ordinary*, for as some manage that, and other Arguments, it might prove *Lay-men* Praying, yea, and Preaching too in Publick, *Numb. 10. 35.* seems to me as little. *Adasas* said, *Ergo*, What if God made Forms of Prayer, or Liturgy. Did he read that short Sentence? I do not think, you believe he ever did. So *Deut. 32.* was not a Prayer sure. If such were found in your Liturgy, Men would say of you, as *Paul* says, some would say, *That saw men pray in an unknown tongue.* That was a Song or Psalm, which may be Historical, Doctrinal, Prophetical, as well as Petitionary. Many other Answers might be given

to this. The Expression there were not used together, but some Words on one occasion, some on another. This was not a Prayer made for the Priests; much less in Sacrificing. That was the Question. But the first Answer is sufficient, and I care as little as any Man for supernumerary Arguments. The first seems to me clear, but I will not say *Unconfutable*, considering whom I have to deal with.

I remember, I have heard of a Judge, who demanding the reasons of one Man's not Appearing at the Court, as he was required the Assizes before. One answered, *My Lord, there are twelve Reasons. The first is, the Man is Dead, and therefore could not come. Secondly.— Nay, stop Friend, said the Judge, keep the other Eleven to thy self; that one is sufficient.* I think of this sometimes when writing.

Did I ever Question worthy Sir, whether ever God made or impos'd Forms of *Psalms*, that you tell me were used in the Temple? No sure, I thought Singing and Praying had been distinct Duties. Else some distinguish where is no difference. God made these Forms under the Law, and rein-

reinforced them in the *New Testament*, & without his *Institution*, the thing had been an Abomination, as would have been once Circumcision and the Passover, and now Baptism and the Lords Supper without this. You urge; *2 Cron. 29. 30.* I Answer, we doubt not but the Church may require what God hath Commanded, for it is there said, *All was done by the Commandment of the King from the Mouth of the Lord, Chap. 31. 25.* The Writer of the *Lamentations* was *Jeremias* and therefore what *Jeremy* did, he did from God. As what the Apostles did, they did from Christ, who in his 40 Days Conversing with them, after his Resurrection, taught them the things, pertaining to the Kingdom of God, that is, the Government of the Church. *Jeremias* required the People to use Scripture. (*The Lamentations,*) Therefore what, I know not who may make Prayers, (and broken ones too) for them who have a readiness to express themselves to God as occasion is, I will not say, the Argument taken from the *Lamentations*, look's like a lamentable Argument, it is not Grave enough

enough in it self, and therefore not fit to be written to so Grave a Man. For, 1 Bar. 14. 15. I am so much a *Protestant*, and so little a *Papist*, that I slight it. We can no more know the Mind of God by the Practise of the *Jews*, than the Mind of Christ by the Practise of the *Papist*, or some others, who would take it ill, to be named with them. God's mind is my enquiry, not their practise. Forms of Prayer came from *Babylon*, say you, you shall have it, say I. The reading *Apocryphal Books* in Churches, *Hooker* in his *Eccles. Pol.* could hardly forbear Censuring it. I think it was one of the most Devilish designs Satan ever had, to clap those Books at the end of the *Old Testament* to ridicule the whole. To say nothing of the Book of *Tobit*, or *Esdra*s, which *Bellarmin* would hardly undertake to plead for. I stick not to say of the admired Book of *Wisdom*. (said by some to be so much like Inspir'd Writings.) That the *Author* was a grand R—— who tells us of *Solomon's* Prayer to God, that he might Govern according to the Example of *David* his Father. Must the Writings of *Philo*, a *Jew*,
written

written after the *Jews* were unchurch-
 ed, an unbelieving, lying Prophet,
 be read with Canonical Scripture, and
 as Lessons? Let us bring in *George*
Fox's Journal next. I could say much
 of the Book *Bar.* you cite, were it
 convenient. You urge *Dan. 3. Ergo,*
 What? Men must pray, not read, and
 that according to the Ability God
 gives, would be a better Consequence
 than what it is brought for. 136
Psalms, you urge, I say it was a *Psalms*,
 and for your *Te Deum*, keep us this
 day without sin; had need be well
 qualified to keep Men from *Quaker-*
ish Dotages about a Sinless State. 2
Gron. 5. 3. Proves not it was the
 same *Psalms*. If it were, it proves no-
 thing to our Argument, much less
 7 *Chap. 3.* Did *David* never say but
 in that *Psalms*; For he is good, and his
 mercy endureth for ever? 20 *Chap. 21.*
 The Argument is *ejusdem farinae*. So
Ezra 3. 11. Your Opinion is only assert-
 ed by a common Saying, not proved.
 If it were, no more would follow but
 this; that the same *Psalms* may be
 often sung, which no Man denies.
Numb. 10. 35. compared by you with
 163 *Psalms 8.* Induceth me to think,
 they

they used not the same Words, but some, and the other place proves it a *Crit.* 6. 41. The use of a Sentence or two upon extraordinary occasions appointed by God, will not prove the use of Set, Solemn, many Prayers in all Publick Administrations appointed by Men.

The *Jews* never had a *Liturgy*; the Book of *Psalms* was hardly ever pleaded in this Argument by the Old, Famous Advocates for the *Church of England*, but by some late, and less judicious Writers. I remember, I have heard that Bishop *Andrew* was about to Print in *Oxon* a *Liturgy* of the *Jews* to prove they had one under the Law, but it was stopt, from going to the Press, being proved to be made by them since their Apostacy. Of all Men under Heaven, none care to go to the present *Jews* for a Pattern of Worship, unless such as love indecency and disorder, instead of the contrary so much talkt of.

What you write of *Schism* I wonder at, what Church invite, and call you me to? Is not the present Church Seismatical according to some Men? But I will not harp on that.

String

Will you stand to Mr. Hales's Determination of Schism, of whose Opinion I am? And therefore be-
 lieve the now called (but falsely so) Church of England, is a notorious schismatical one, from the Old one in Doctrine, Discipline and Manners. They are alike in imposing unnecessary things, (suspiciously evil, if not really so,) which Paul would not do on them; he knew could not comply.

Schism doth not signify primarily by Paul, any Separation from a Church, but Heats, and Uselessness in it. For the Corinthians did not erect Altar against Altar. Saith Paul, That there be no schisms in the body, but that the members take care one of another. That Minister, who Preacheth not in season, and out of season — is a Schismatick, while Preaching against Schism. Members of a Church that are not forward for acts of Piety and Charity, are Schismaticks. Alienation of Affection was condemned by Paul.

What you mean by plainly and positively a Sin, I am not sure. What it be so by Consequence? What if I have a doubtful Conscience about it. Must I be Damned to obey the Church?

In short, The Apostles Rule is this,

G

Let

Let us judge one another no more; but
with the infirmities of the weak. *Do not
him that eateth not.* Rom. 14. The
Church on Earth can take me off the
Rule, whatever Church commands
me otherwise, commands me contrary
to the Law of Christ, by *Paul*, and
whom I must obey, judge you.

With you, no Kneeling, no Sacra-
ment, no Cross, no Baptism. The
the Salvation of Infants without Bap-
tism be (foolishly, I confess) question-
ed. Yet run a risk, rather than part
with a Ceremony. Good God, what
madness doth Superstition bring
Men to! If the most Religious Man
in the Parish cannot kneel, he must
go without the *Lords-Supper* all his
Days, and be Excommunicated, and
Imprisoned, too. How shall I Curse
whom God hath Blessed? Could even
a wicked *Balaam* say as bad as he would.

These wicked, wicked Proceedings
against Brethren, prove your Church
Schismatical, or Schism-maker with a
vengeance. Not to name what *Ames*
in his *Fresh-Suit*, *Gelasius* in his *Eng-
lish Popish Ceremonies*, say with ma-
ny others against kneeling, I affirm
your *Mr. Long* of *Exon*, in his first
Book against *Mr. Baxter*, writes a-
bout

about 16 Years since, says more than
 them all, by affirming that kneeling,
 and taking up the Old Form of
 Words, *The Body of our Lord Jesus
 Christ — Preserve thy Body and Soul*
 (not used in King Edwards days)
 was to favour them that owned the
 Real Presence, and to quiet them that
 believe *Transubstantiation*. Oh hor-
 rible! Who shall countenance such
 Idolaters as these; which your Church
 calls so? Who in this Adoration are
 very Idolaters, as the *Laplanders*,
 who Worship a Red Cloth.

Here Sir, I beg your Pardon, I am
 gone, I confess, too far into this parti-
 cular, but more of this hereafter if oc-
 casion be.

It was denied at the *Savoy Con-
 ference* between the *Episcopalians* and
Presbyterians, that Ministers had liber-
 ty in their Pulpits to use their Gifts in
 Prayer. And the design of *Laud* be-
 fore, and many others since, was, we
 are sure, by the *Liturgy* to hinder Mi-
 nisterial Gifts this way. It is well
 Experience is thought by you, wor-
 thy of consideration in this place.

I pray, Sir, when saw you any one
 Person, Minister, or Hearer, shed
 one Tear, or Sigh at the *Common-*

Prayer? No. The *Liturgy* (as well as another thing) doth not bite. I remember not in *Plymouth, Oxen*, or elsewhere I saw one. No, where this comes, there is no *Rochim*. I speak not of your *Alms-House-People*, or such who know not a Prayer from a Chapter, nor of one or two Ministers, or great Men, who may be fit thus to have done, tho I know none.

One would think some Men should not talk of Schism thus without end. Have you such plain, positive word for, or against some sort of *Conventicles*, or some Publick Worship? or your vain Repetitions may be justified by the 136 *Psalms*, remember then may the Tautologies of some *Dissenters*, you so much talk of, be justified the same way, which I will not grant, you have my suffrage in blaming them, I know few such. Thus the *Quakers* also, who shall plead 136 *Psalms* as well as you, for their vain Repetitions. In extraordinary Cases, such Modes of Praying, or Praising may be justified, that cannot be brought into common Practice. Besides, what words God puts into our Mouths must not be questioned: Because Scripture says, (and you

read openly) *He that pisseth against the wall*; may you therefore say in your Service-book any thing of *S—against the wall*?

Feasts and Fasts, are things required by the Law of Nature, antecedent to Scripture Revelation. *Heathens* used them Who in this Controversie, called these Symbolical, till a late intolerable Scribler. None questioneth but the Magistrate had power to appoint the *5th. of November*, upon reasons from Scripture, tho I think your Instance proves it not. That they did it of themselves without direction from God in the Feast of *Trin.* Christ being present at the Feast of *Dedication*, (where he at first refused to go,) to Preach to the People, no more proves his owning that imposition, than a *Nonconformist* preaching on *Christmas-day* to keep Men from Debauchery, or cautioning them against it, will prove his owning the Observation of that Day, or Christ's being then Born, which your *Joseph Mead*, learnedly proves was not that Day, nor at that time of the Year. You your selves, I doubt not, would take occasion to Preach on such a day which you approve not of.

Here they were gathered to whom Christ was sent; yet I take this Instance to be nothing to our purpose. Who censures your Church for observing the 30th. of *January* as a day of Fasting, or the 29th. of *May* as a day of Thanksgiving? Yet that lies fair for an Objection of weight. Where do we read of Anniversary Fasts of Divine Appointment. A Fast seems to be appointed *pro Nata*.

Whether all that is said by some of the Jews Baptizing of Proselytes be true, I will not say; if true, I have ever been of Opinion, they sinn'd, and it was an Abomination. They were forbid to add, as well as diminish. Good Sir, speak plainly. might you have appointed Circumcision, if God had not done it? That Christ appointed Baptism from this Practice of theirs, sounds hard with me, and can no more be prov'd than, that Christ appointed Bread and Wine in the Lord's Supper from the *Corymbes*, or such as they. What I said before, I stick to, we can no more know the mind of God by Old Jewish Customs, than now by Popish ones.

To say you make not the Cross

Essential

Essential to Baptism, is to confess, or say, that you, not Christ appointed that additional Sign, we know, your Consciences tell you, the Ancients Baptized without it.

I think it not proper to direct to Books, or send any, else I might Parker's Learned Folio against that worst of Ceremonies.

Custom cannot make your Phantastical Dresses decent, else the Popish Trinkets are as justifiable as yours. They might plead, it is the Custom of their Country, that is decent in one place, that is not in another, &c. But I say, *Paris* indecency could be decency no where, for this was your Notion, what was done without his decency and order, was every where, and at all times (ordinarily) indecent and disorderly. I have proved sufficiently your Surplice, &c. not so. It is not hard to call that phantastical, foolish, or vain now that the wise God once for great reasons appointed. Would not such a Dress as *Parsons*, now be odious, a Bell, &c. Then there can be no phantastical Worship in the World. What a ridiculous thing had Circumcision been, had not the Institution had

a Divine Stamp upon its King
will not have Subjects Images on their
Coin, but their own, small pieces as
well as great.

I should not have believ'd the cloth
to be yours; were I not sure it was
your own Hand. Vestments are ne-
cessary in *Genere*, therefore a Surplice
in *Specie*, may be used say you. My
Argument was, that Sacred Vest-
ments are not necessary in *Genere*,
all such were Nailed at Christ's Cross,
therefore are not to be determin'd in
Specie. Your Surplice is no civil
Dress, else your Argument was irri-
fragable; no, it is a *Sacrum pallium*.
It is accounted a piece of Prophaness
to use it *Extra sacra*. It is handled
with Reverence. Why they call it
Super-pellicium, I have spent time to
consider, is it from *Pellex*? God
keep us from tearing Christ's body in
pieces, say you, *Turpe est Doctori* —
and from tearing the Body Politick,
too, say I.

Your Paper and mine call for a
Close, so do my Circumstances. Young
Men are waiting my motions whilst
now with me in the Room, I writing
this Reply, *Currente Calamo*. I think
is not convenient yet to offer my
greatest Arguments against some
things,

thing
In
for n
in t
If
word
look
I t
do
whic
fair
Cere
too,
ticks
mine

I b
I

IN
for
to G
be)
O B
nou
Ch
Gif

things, till I see farther Necessity.
I now urge no places of Scripture
for my Opinions; this may be done
in time, only answer yours.

If I have given any unpleasing
words, be pleas'd to be so kind to
look on them as *non Scripta*.

I thank you for your freedom, and
do not despise your Arguments,
which tho a common practise, is no
fair one. I know not, but that some
Ceremonious Scots, and English Men
too, now must be notorious Schisma-
ticks on your Principles as well as
mine.

Your Servant.

*I hate vain Inventions, but thy Law do
I love says, David.*

Postscript

IN the Administration of the two
Great Ordinances, no place is left
for the Ministers Gifts; not in Prayer
to God, and which is worse (if worse can
be) not in Instructions to the People.
O Blessed Apostle, when thou didst e-
numerate Ministerial Gifts to the
Church of Corinth, thou didst forget the
Gift of Reading, and the Church of

G 5

En.

England: Give these Men a Common Prayer Book in one Hand, and a Book of Homilies in the other, they have enough. This is done, not only in Publick Churches, but Private Houses.

Did the *Jews* read Prayers in the time of Christ? The *Pharisees* Practice shews their Custom. You cannot think, they knew that unmanly, as well as unscriptural word, *I Pray*, who reads Prayers to Day?

What Ancients did you attempt to Name that did this? In what Countrey did they live?

Did they read Prayers in their *Amilcans*, that *Pliny* telleth *Trajan* of?

I grant, as you say, your Prayers are moving Prayers; for it is a hard matter to sit still and hear them, and the most serious commonly leave them.

It seems to me a poor Plea, for any one to say for such a Worship only, *it is lawful*. What if only the Lords Prayer was us'd in a Parish at the Lords Supper, would you continue there and say, it is lawful, &c. And not go to another place where done much better?

Are some few words enough of Plague, Pestilence, and Famine, &c? I re-

I remember I have read, when *London-Bridge* was on Fire, the Priest (Pardon me Sir, it was the Name *Laud* gave, and blotted out the word Minister) brought the Common Prayer Book and Read; For all Women labouring with Child, for all sick Persons, and young Children, &c. An Old Woman cryed out, Good Lord, what is all this to *London-Bridge*, &c. Do you call that a Prayer, where a few words are read to God in a large History, or Spoken to Men when we Pray with our Hats on and a Cup in our hand, at Home, at Feasts, in Coffee-Houses, when we speak of the King, Church, or our Friends? Using commonly in a conceived Prayer the same words for the King or Parliament, &c. Make it not a Form.

Is it Lawful, or would it not be Phantastical to have Crowns on your Heads, and Palms in your Hands, as well as white Robes on your Backs? You know how *John* saw Christ, *Rev.* 1. What if you wore such a Girdle, would it not be Phantastical?

Schism, you, now tell me, was the Point you did Pursue; I am sure, you did not so at first. I cannot Answer your thoughts, but words.

Would

Would you not Baptise Infants, but only the Adult, if your Church so requir'd, and say, There is no plain positive Command to the contrary? A doubtfull Conscience was much with Paul.

Is this sense?

Nothing can excuse our running in Schism, but the imposing of what is plainly and positively a Sin.

Would it be Schism then as you call it?

Conformist.

THere are several Passages which do well deserve to be animadverted upon, but I pass all to pursue our main point till that be settled, and then we will proceed as you see cause. For as to the Reason, use, and advantage of our Liturgy, Ceremonies, &c. It is not time to come to that, till we have first consider'd; whether the imposing these be a sufficient cause for Schism, because, if it be not all the inconveniences, Improprieties which you objected, were they granted, will not excuse your separation from the Church, or make your separation not to be a Schism.

In order to this I will let down the Power (as I conceive) the Church hath not, *scilicet*. To appoint means of Grace, and by this I cut off most of the Popish Ceremonies.

2. That the Church hath Power to appoint Ceremonies, or Rights of an inferior order to this.

This you seem to deny, and build upon the Command of not adding to, or diminishing from the Law of God.

But to add to the Law of God, is to add something as the Law of God, which is not. For if I add some Ceremony or Circumstance, unless I pretend that it is the Law of God, or a part of it, it is no addition to the Law.

Teaching for Doctrines the Commandments of Men, this is an addition to Gods Law, when I teach the Commandments of Men as Doctrines, that is as Laws of God, but to teach the Commandments of Men, only as the Commandments of Men, this is not teaching them as Doctrines, and so no addition to the Law of God.

Thus for Example, when we teach the use of a Surplice only as a Commandment of Men, we add not to the Law. But if you forbid a Surplice

spice as a thing unlawful, tho commanded by humane Law, then you teach this as a Doctrine, and so you, say we add to the Law of God: For forbidding is as much a Law of God as enjoying.

Now then there are but two things to make our Ceremonies or Rights unlawful, and consequently which can justify a separation on their Account.

1. If they are forbidden in Scripture.

2. If we teach them as Doctrines and Laws of God; and seeing neither of these are the Case, I see no third thing that can justify a separation upon this Account. Let us keep close to this point till we have ended it. Let us settle to our selves some Rule, by which we must govern our selves in this important enquiry.

Now give me leave to take notice of some Passages in your Paper which relate to these. For the other, I pass by as I said at first.

You say, that with us, no Kneeling, no Sacrament. No Cross, no Baptism. Nay, tho the Salvation of Infants dying without it be questioned, yet run a Risque here, rather than go without the Cross; Good God

God (say you) Whus madness doth
 Superstition lead Men to? Now might
 I not justly remove this Exclamation?
 What will prejudice, or, Make Men
 believe? For in the Office of private
 Baptism, which is, particularly ap-
 pointed for Children that are in dan-
 ger of Death, the Cross is not used:
 And whoever useth it in private Bap-
 tism, transgresseth the Rubrick and
 the Common Prayer, which is a De-
 monstration, that our Church doth
 not think the Cross necessary in Bap-
 tism, or to be a part of it. Yet
 you bring this as an Argument, that
 she did think it necessary, and so ne-
 cessary, as to Risque a Child dying
 without Baptism, rather then go with-
 out the Cross.

As great a mistake is That of No
 Kneeling, no Sacrament. Every day
 it is given to Sick Persons without
 Kneeling, and where there is any rea-
 sonable excuse it will not be exacted.

But let me ask you, will you give it
 in your Church to one that doth
 kneel? If not, as I believe you will
 tell me, I am sure others have, then
 you lay greater stress upon the Po-
 sture then we do. You teach it as a
 Doctrine abstracted from humane
 Laws

Laws; we teach it injoynd only as a Law of Men, and so alterable by Men, and to oblige no otherwise.

You say of the Jews Institution of Baptism that they find in it, and that it was an Abomination.

Now Sir, I beseech you, if it had been so, was it not at least highly probable, that Christ would some where or other have reprov'd it? Would not some mark of Gods displeasure, have been exprest against it? But,

2. Would God have honour'd it so greatly as to have complied with it, to have Countenanced it so far, as to send *John* to Baptize? Would Christ himself have submitted to it, to be Baptis'd himself? Would he have instituted Baptism, as the initiating Form of his Church, for any to be establisht in it?

But on the other hand, if the Jewish Church appointed Baptism, and joyn'd it to Circumcision, upon the admission of Prosylites, as we do the Cross, not as a Sacrament appointed, but as the Institution of the Church only, and that this was not adding to the Law of God, or found fault with by God. I think you will find no institution of our Church, but

but what you must excuse by the same Rule: And if Christ shew'd the necessity and obligation that laid on all, to submit to the Institutions of the Church, to say, That it became him to fulfil all Righteousness, speaking of the Baptism which he was to receive, it will reach us a greater Veneration for the Authority of the Church, then is commonly thought of. Would he have called Baptism Righteousness, if in its first institution it had been Sin and an Abomination?

There are several other Particulars in the Paper I should have spoke to, but these come up to the point in hand. And the hurry I am in at present, made me mislay your Paper, and now hardly gives me time to run this over in haste. When this point is once settled between us, I will go with you afterwards to what other you think fit, and according to my Ability deal upon the Square with you.

The Non-conformist.

I Will now according to my promise, in my last to you, and your desire in your last to me, (which just now came to my hand) prove your

Cc-

Ceremonies and Instructions unlawful, or forbidden in Scripture; and therefore Non conformity to them is no Schism. But I think it convenient first to remove some mistakes of yours, I find in your Reply.

I think contrary to you, Men may be guilty of adding to Gods Law, tho not as Gods Law; else a Multitude of Pharisaical Men of Old were not guilty here. Nor their Brethren, the Papist in most of their Ceremonies Condemned, as superstitious and unlawful in that excellent Book of Sound Doctrine. The Book of Homilies, what Christ says, *Teaching for Dis-
ciple the Commandments of Men*, I find says to this effect; For I cannot turn to the Place. The Fear of God is taught by the Precepts of Men. I know, it is commonly pleaded, the Pharisees made their Ceremonies a part of their Oral Tradition, as the unwritten Commands of God by Moses. But as far as I can find this, tho so often said, is said without Proof.

I think, vast is the difference between, not doing a necessary Lawful Action, thro tenderness of Conscience, and the doing an unlawful one thro mistake.

The

The eating of some Meats with Paul, was declared Lawful, tho some thought it otherwise, that they were unlawful, yet he censures them not, chargeth others not to despise them. Commands that they *be born with* Rom. 14. So to the Corinthians, well were it, if this were remembered, and practised by some Men, were these adders to the Word of God? But if any did on a mistake of a thing forbidden, as Circumcision, observing some sort of Days, &c. he says not so of them, but the contrary, they were faults — I am afraid of you — So that our Noncompliance is not so much an adding, as your *in-joining* in your own, neither are we so culpable in our non-observing your Ceremonies if lawful, as your supposing and observing them, if sinful. All things lawful are not expedient, much less necessary.

I meant, No Cross, no Publick Baptism, no Kneeling, no Publick Sacrament, and doubted not you must have so understood, tho you seem not to do so. For that Private Baptism you mention when a Child is like to dye, I ever thought it an unlawful thing; tho some of ours as well as yours

yours too often practise it. It seems to me a Bloody Sacrifice, and such Ministers to forget what God says, *I will have mercy, and not sacrifice.* This Custom I doubt not, hath been the Death of many Children; some have been dying, others quite dead whilst Baptizing. Oh! such in my Opinion, make an Idol of Baptism. The Jews in a case of necessity went 40 Years without Circumcision in the Wilderness. That Custom appears also to me as bad, of giving the Lords Supper to some sick Men. Did you never hear of some dying, others dead with the Bread in their Mouths? O horrid Prophaning of so great and sacred an Ordinance of Christ!

But what if Parents think the Cross unlawful, and the Children live or dye in Infancy without it? What if Men cannot be convinc'd but that Kneeling is unlawful, and an abominable Symbolizing with Popish Idolaters? Must these go without the Lords Supper all their Days, the never so Pious, Humble, and Inquisitive? Must they go without Baptism? I am unwilling to repeat excellent passages out of famous *Davenant de Frat. Communion*, perhaps you may remember

member them. Some *Nonconformists* do give the Sacrament to them that desire to kneel; they that do not, refuse it, because they think it to be a Sin, and the Receiver cannot say they take it to be a Duty.

If all be true, (which I have reason to doubt) about the Jews admitting Proselytes by Baptism, as well as Circumcision, it will not follow it is justified because *Christ* condemned it not for *Christ* never condemned the Superstitious Lives of the *Essense*, Speculative, or Practical, which *Josephus*, and others speak of at large. No, not so much as name them, which hath given occasion to some (foolishly I think) to question whither ever there was such a Sect. Neither doth it appear to me, *Christ* appointed Baptism from the Jewish Custom, if taking it for granted such there was; but from the aptness of the Sign to the thing signified. What then, was the Baptism of *John* thus from men, not from heaven? *Christ* calls Gods Ordinances (not Mans) Righteousness, 3. *Mat.*

Now Sir, I come to say more to your great Question, whether your Ceremonies, or Worship be forbidden

den in Scripture, or our Nonconformity free from Schism? Some things are forbidden in Scripture, more particularly, some more generally, some by good consequence, others more directly.

Stand fast (saith Paul) *in the liberty wherewith Christ hath set you free, and be not again intangled with the yoke of bondage.* It seems too narrow to say, from Ceremonies God once appointed, if Men may bring in theirs, when he hath thrown out his.

Paul saith, *Be ye not the servants of men*, if your Injunctions were indifferent, yet the imposing them on the weak is forbidden 14 Rom. What Man on Earth can take me off from Pauls Determination at large. *Let us judge one another no more*, a Chapter as if written on purpose against your *Act of Uniformity*. 2 Collos. 14. Did God nail to the Cross of Christ his own Ceremonies? Did he call them beggarly Rudiments, carnal Ordinances?

What worse Names do yours deserve, that are of a base Descent, and Badges of abominable Superstitions. If I must have Ceremonies, give me the Old Jewish ones, of Gods own making, that were once good, not yours

yours.

that y

If

Matr

Dreis

Mals

agree

with

here

I ca

very

to be

these

again

one M

Oath

give

can b

could

him

since

pute,

lets i

in the

I occ

Men,

cited

bout

must

lajun

I will

yours, (of whose making shall I say?)
that were never good.

If it becomes not a grave, chaste
Matron, to be found in a Whorish
Dress, it becomes not us to use
Males Priests Sacred Garments. What
agreement hath the Temple of God
with Idols, deserves consideration
here.

I take *Clerick* Conformity to be a
very great sin, and *Lay* Conformity
to be no small one; the former for
these reasons, *Church-Wardens* must be
again sworn, if occasion be; What
one Man of them did, or can keep his
Oath? Must Ministers study ways to
drive Men to Hell, as if they did not
sin fast enough of themselves? I
could write at large here, but *Ver-
bum sat Sapienti*. This one thing con-
vincoeth me beyond all doubt or dis-
pute, some Men are falsely called Fa-
thers in God, who rather are Fathers
in the ——— Swear they must again
if occasion be, to persecute the best of
Men, that they may be Excommuni-
cated, and delivered to the Devil a-
bout a Toy and Ceremony. Swear
must I to obey my Ordinary in his
Injunctions, and how far, *pro re Nata*,
I will not now determine. Would
you

you dare to deal thus with *Austin*, for
 some of his Opinions, and other Fa-
 thers were they alive, for some of
 theirs contrary to yours, as well as
B. Hooper, was Imprison'd for scrup-
 ling your Ceremonies, and *Calvin* is
 almost damned for an Heretick and
 Traytor? Your great *Hooker* says
That in his Eccles. Pol. that would ne-
 cessitate him to be a *Non conformist* if
 now alive. I affirm, I were bound
 by my Oath to read a Writ of Ex-
 communication against *Arminians*,
 were I a Parish Priest which I daved
 not do, tho they be very Erroneous
 and Condemned by your Church.

Are Seven Years spent in a Gram-
 mar-School, and Seven more in the
 University, to bring a Minister to
 this pass to be a Reader, and a lazy
 Prelates Curate?

Who now examines before Admit-
 tion to the Sacrament, or Keeps off
 the Scandalous? Who are they that
 have Ears (if not Mouths) for all
 Discourse? It is Accounted a high
 Commendation of such a Minister
 now to say, *He is an honest Man*.
 When honesty will bring the Hear-
 ers (or them) to Heaven, we may all
 be content with an honest Minister.

Sanctifi-

Sancti-
 will,
 onness
 no, it
 some,
 Scabb
 the Fo
 sanctifi
 on on
 Wh
 etures
 der, t
 and Co
 or Dr
 were
 within
 beauti
 cate f
 Parker
 phem
 was n
 hied b
 of tha
 and th
 sectio
 and
 some
 no o
 hated
 W
 of C

Sanctification by a Mans own free will, Justification by his own Righteousness, salvation by his own works is no strange Doctrine now. Thus some, not only build Wood, Hay, Stubble, on the Foundation, but make the Foundation it self so, that make sanctification so, and build Justification on it.

Whatever talk of Curious Structures and Churches, Uniformity, Order, there is, whilst the Members and Communicants, there are Deists, or Drunkards, all is nothing. Thus were there Serpents and Crocodiles, within the *Egyptian Temples*, when beautiful without. What an Advocate for the Church of *England* was *Parker's E. Pol.* What Atheistical Blasphemous Expressions had he? He was notwithstanding greatly magnified by some Men, when as the Mouth of that Church he discover'd his own, and their sanguinary (as one said) affections to us, as if both like *Romulus* and *Remus*, had been Nursed up by some Woolf. The Dissenters need no other Commendation, but to be hated and malign'd by such.

What Stories tell they (saith he) of Communion between them and

H

the

the Lord Christ. I am forced to write of some things in haste, as they occur to my mind ; I must do my work this Evening, knowing I shall have unusual and extraordinary business the next Week. I Pray you therefore, Pardon my not putting every thing in its order, or doing some things, *Ex abundanti.*

Some things I have mention'd as contrary to several places of Scripture, are so to more.

Whatsoever things says *Paul*, are comely and of good report : *Offend not thy Brother, shun the appearance of Evil.*

If you say, some may be better then they before censur'd, *A Quia me vestigia terrent ;* To return to the Consideration of Ceremonies, &c.

Moses, and *David*, and *Solomon*, about the work of Gods House, and the Council of *Jerusalem* did, and imposed what seem'd good to God, not themselves, to the Holy Ghost, not their own fancies.

Things of a civil Nature, common to Men, as well as Christians, to civil Actions, as well as Religious (as Love Feasts, Kiss of Charity) may be done without Divine appointment ;

All

All our Anti-Ceremonial Men with one consent grant to all the world, the natural signs of Devotion, as the lifting up the Eyes and Hands to Heaven, bowing the Knee before God, if not enjoined (tho they are so) might be used. Also civil signs of Subjection, as *Eleazers* laying his hand under *Abrahams* Thigh, things done by Divine Instinct, things extorted by necessity and extraordinary Providences are no precedent to us, (as *Anointing with Oil*, which was *pro tempore* as was the miracle annexed to it,) these things are affirmed by *Ames*, and others; (I pray by the way, give over boasting, *Hooker* was never answer'd till *Dr. Ames's Fresh Suit* be so.) Had it been the mind of God to teach his Church by Ceremonies, would not he himself have appointed them, as once he did? What place may not, or cannot the Cross be used in? Did *Dr. Stillingfleet* well answer *Mr. Stillingfleet's Irenicum*, or the excellent Preface thereto, I suppose, you do remember? The Church's power to appoint Ceremonies, was not in the old 39 Articles. How came they in the new ones? 147 Psalm, To make the power of the Church to bind the consciences of Men, was put in the Contents by some *Innovators*, to make it canonical, seeing they could not find it in the Text. It is often said by the Papists, (and truly I think^o) when you plead against them, you use our arguments, and when you plead against us, you use theirs.

God never made Ceremonies under the Law antecedently necessary, or in their own nature, but consequently so by virtue of a Divine Command. Shall human commands make things thus necessary that a Divine Command once did? May men thus usurp Gods Throne, and when there act Satan's part.

If Clerick *conformity* be very unlawful, for reasons before given, no power on earth can take *ministers* off their work, or make them as private men, especially when they see so little conversion work elsewhere, if they must preach, others must hear, and countenance them, suffering in their righteous cause; yet I question not the Integrity of many Liturgical *ceremonial men*, (and hope, yours in particular) God often accepts the man, when not the worship.

I dar'd not accost a Personage of your figure and character I thank you you were pleased to write the first Letter, and that you do not so triumph in your Ceremonies, as to give them anctuary from our Examination. Many Arguments I could allonate with, and annex to these of the same complexion against your modes of Worship; but the fewer the better.

You see my plainness without any dress of words to set off my apprehensions with; your Church above all other Protestant Churches, shews herself such a Plenipotentiary, (as some observe) as if it could turn all things, tho never so

odd, into Orthodox, as what is Fabled; *Abbas* toucht, was Gold; many of your Bishops (those great little men, are better acquainted with their Service Book, and Ceremonies, than with the Bible, I will not say all I know of this. I saw an instance of this, when a smart Boy of eighteen years old, suddenly gag'd a Bishop, (having thousands by the year, yet alive,) as you would confess should I tell you the Story, when the Bishop sent for him to his *chamber*, and was pressing him to *conformity*.

What beauty, fits on the face of Gospel simplicity? Would some men (as *Mervil* expresseth it,) if commanded by your Church, carry salt bags on their backs, to put them in mind of having salt in themselves, or as *Zanchy* wrote to Queen *Elizabeth*, were her Subjects bound to put on *Turkish* weeds, or Garments, if she commanded them? Saith he, *No*, much less (he adds,) the execrable Garments of Mass Priests.

It is now past Eleven of the Clock, I received your Letter abroad this Afternoon, and came not home till between eight or nine of the Clock. I take your Question to be comprehensive, and therefore have taken the more liberty. I find our friend, *Mr. K.* and others could wish we proceeded not. I told them, I was not very desirous to disturb you in greater, more necessary, or more useful work, wherein you have obliged the World; therefore writing once more, I

thought, I would write my mind fully and plainly, If you see fit to Reply, you may to what you please, and let other things alone. And I intend to be concite, and follow you where you please to lead me, or if you think a private conference before a few judicious Persons best, your pleasure in this, is a Law to your Servant.

I greatly honour your old famous Advocates, as *Hooker*, *Fisher*, the blind *Cambridge* man, his Dialogue between *Ireneus*, and *Novatus*, *Sprins Cassander Anglicanus*, or others, who exercised my mind several years; But for *Patrick's Friendly Debate*, and now Bishop *King*, and others make woful work in comparison of the Old *Workmen*. *Darel* and such writers, I am greatly offended with, who tell the world of I know not what stories of the *Presbyterians* neglect of the Lords Supper in the *Inter-Regnum*; I know the contrary, where I have been, they once a month administred that Ordinance; and *Mr. Hickman*, in a Latin Tract, *Apologia pro Ministris in Anglia, vulgo Non Conformistis*, hath sufficiently answered that charge, I only add what I have known, that where some Presbyterian Ministers came into some Parishes, they hardly could find a man but what was guilty of gross ignorance, or Prophanness. Then they did forbear according to your order, tho not practice, till Religion might take place, where was not common civility before;

for

for you know K. C. the I. and Bishop
Land by the Book of Sports, and other
 ungodly proceedings, had banisht almost
 all Religion and Good manners out of
 the Nation : In *Oxford*, they thought it
 not enough to be a Member of a Col-
 ledge, to be so of a Church. Therefore
 several serious Persons, receiv'd some of
 one Famous Doctor or Preacher, some of
 another, and so did many Towns People,
 Men and Women I knew.

This perhaps occasion'd, not doing it
 in some Churches where Persons dis-
 own'd, by your good constitution would
 be ready thrust in. Your Ministers ought
 to forbear where men be Ignorant, Scan-
 dalous, or Contentious.

If I have erred in any thing, I have
 written, or given you any occasion of of-
 fence, I beg your Pardon, as not a thing,
Ex in deffra. To tell you, that I greatly
 value you, would be but an Idle Com-
 plement.

Didl you never hear that Doct. F.
 pleaded in a Sermon in *Oxford*, for Re-
 verence, and said, *Eleezer when he*
pray'd, made the Camels so Kneel?

Or of one desiring a Minister to read
 Prayers of Thanksgiving, for Recovery
 from a Bull Gooring, read the Prayer for
 Purification. *We thank thee for delivering*
this thy Servant, from the great pain and
peril of Bull Gooring.

Or of one whole House being on fire,
 sent for the Parson to read the Prayer

for

for Rain, and when he read gentle showers,
The man cryed out, *Good Lord, Baskets
full.*

Yet your Prayers are said to be such,
that the wit of men or Angels cannot
mend. I am displeas'd with some Dis-
senters broken Prayers, as much as you,
some few of them are almost as confus'd
as your Liturgy.

Conformist.

YOur Argument, that we may be guilty
of adding to Gods Law, tho not
as Gods Law, like the *Pharisaical Man*
of Old, and the *Papist* in most of their
Ceremonies, were not guilty say you.
Guilty of what? There are other Guilt
besides that of adding to Gods Law; and
even as to Ceremonies, they may be too
many, insignificant and burdensome, and
men may lay too great streis upon them,
beyond the Nature of the things, and
yet come not to the length of adding
them to Gods Law, which the *Pharisees*
did by those traditions, which they said,
were delivered by *Moses* on the Mount,
and descended orally down to their times,
and therefore of as great Authority as
the Written Law, which gave occasion
to the oral traditions of the Church of
Rome. Again, some of their traditions
did point blank, contradict the Law of
God, as that of *Corban*, *Mat. 15. 6*.
And, some, tho not contradicting the
Law of God, yet in practice were pre-
fer'd to the Law of God, and these tra-
diti-

ditions our Saviour did confirm, only corrected the abuse. These things ye ought to have done said he, but not to leave the other undone. Now there are several Errors men may commit, as to the Ceremonies, but all are not alike, all may be reprehended and redress, desir'd with the decency and regard which is due to our Superiors: But all are not sufficient cause for Schism, and that is the only point which I now pursue. I say, none are a sufficient cause for Schism, except those which are injoyn'd as part of Gods Law, or which are appointed as means of Grace, which includes both the former.

There may be many burdensome and inconvenient Laws of the Land, and Redress may be sought in these, yet they are not a sufficient cause to take up Arms and Rebel against the State; and so it is in the Church. Nothing can be a sufficient cause, but where something is contrary to the Law of God, is impos'd as a condition of Communion, for if it be not impos'd on me, I may still joyn in Communion without Sin, and then I ought so to joyn, and it is a sin not to joyn. As if an impious Law were enacted in the State, yet I thought not to Rebel for this, only if it be impos'd on me, I ought to refuse it, and so it is in the Church.

There is no cause for Rebellion in the Church, that is not as sufficient for Rebellion in the State. You urge the Oath of a Church-Warden, as a cause for

H s

Schism

Schism: But all that can be infer'd from thence is, that those that scruple that Oath, should not be Church-Wardens. It is not impos'd as a condition upon any, and there is the same reason to Rebel against the State for that Oath, (for it is injoyn'd by Law) as to make a Schism for it in the Church.

I now come to the main Proof, That is, from Scripture. You quote four Texts, *Stand fast therefore in the Liberty wherewith Christ hath set you free, and be not again intangled with the Yoke of Bondage.* 2. *Be ye not the Servants of Men.* Rom. 3. 14. And the fourth is, *Galos. 14. To the first I say, The Yoke of Bondage was the Law of Moses, to which the Jewish Converts did seek to oblige Christians; which was the occasion of the Council call'd at Jerusalem, Acts 15. And the Liberty wherewith Christ hath set us free, is from the Bondage of that Law.* Christian Liberty must not be understood to give every man Liberty to do what he pleaseth, or to free men from the Lawful Commands of Superiours, therefore no consequence can be drawn from this Text, to warrant Schism upon this Account of our Ceremonies, unless they be prov'd to be unlawful, and secondly, to be impos'd as Terms of Communion. The second Text, *Be ye not the Servants of men, of Literily taken, will maintain the Right of Masters over their Servants, and in no sound sence will come to the Case in hand.*

World. *Answer,* That the Love Feasts and Kifs of Charity, were used in Religious Worship is certain; indeed, Love and Feasting, Kissing and Charity too, are things of a Civil Nature in the Civil or common use of them, but when they were appointed in Religious Worship, they became of a Religious Nature: All actions, or things are of a civil or Religious Nature, as they are used to a Religious, or civil use. As Musick in the Church, or out of the Church, are of the same nature as to it self, but it receives a different denomination, according to the different uses it is put to: with the same Tongue we perform Religious Worship, and at other times profane God. Now, I would gladly know a reason why Musick, or a Surplice might not be used in Religious Worship, as well as Kissing, or Feasting.

I beseech you to consider impartially, and let us proceed upon Principles, and Reasons, and not upon Passion and Prejudice which blind the Eyes of wise Men. But put things to the utmost, if any cannot overcome his Scruples against Musick, for example, Let him go to the Church where it is not used, which are many in the Kingdom; and however, he may think it inconvenient, unless he can prove it positively forbidden by Scripture, or by necessary consequence, here is no ground for Schism, for that is our point.

The NONCON.

When I said, The *Pharisees*, and *Papist* in your sense, were not Guilty, you say, Guilty of what? I answer, Of adding to Gods Law, I thought plain, tho of violating the Rules of Decency, &c. If the Ceremonies of the *Pharisees* were too many insignificant, and burthensom, and such are the *Papists*, say you, but who shall be judge? How much stress is laid upon yours, I have shewn.

Beyond the nature of the thing, are words I understand not. *Mosaic* Ceremonies were not changed in nature, but in use; neither is Baptism, or the Lords Supper now, else these had been a duty now, and those then, a Divine Stamp made those once, and these now necessary, which you say a Human command doth, as you tell us. I think you wrong the Church of Rome, if you say, That she maketh sprinkling with Holy Water, &c. in your sense, a part of Gods Worship, and of Oral Tradition from Christ or the Apostles. Neither doth it appear the *Pharisees* thought washing of Hands when they came from Market, and other Ceremonies parts, of *Moses's* Law, conveyed by Oral Tradition, prove it if you can. Did Christ indeed, confirm Ceremonies prefer'd to Gods Law. These things ought ye to have done, what things? washing of Hands

Repl. 14. Respects the Case of private Persons, Judging one another in things left to their Liberty, but not to oppose the Lawful Commands of Superiors, especially so as to make a Schism upon that Account, the hand Writing of ordinances mention'd, Colos. 2. 14. *Was the Curse of the Law due to us for Sin, which Christ Nailed to his Cross, as is plain from ver. 13. and hath no Relation to that which we enquire after?* These are all the Scriptures you produce, to justify separation on the Account of Ceremonies.

You object a neglect of Examination before the Sacrament, but this is clear, is no sufficient cause for Schism, and it may be best amended without separation by admonishing of others, and shewing them a good Example: Our Rubrick requires it: And therefore they are Non-conformists to our Church who do not practise it.

You say, *That sanctification by a Mans own Free will, Justification by a Mans own Righteousness, Salvation by his own good works is not bad Doctrine now.* I know not where you have heard it; it is expressly contrary to our Articles and Homilies which all our Clergy subscribe, and if any teach otherwise, let them Answer for it: They are therein *Non-conformist*, because not conformable to the Doctrine of the Church, and here can be no cause of Schism, because no such Doctrine, but the contrary is impos'd as a Term of Communion at least to the Clergy. What

What you say of *Parker, Brillingham, Hales*, is nothing to our business. They are but private Doctors, and there can be no cause of Schism here. Would you think that *Baxters* Life were a sufficient cause, were there no other to make separation from the Communion, of which he was a Member. You say, The Church's Power to appoint Ceremonies was not in the Thirty Nine Articles. What if it was, or was not, doth that make them unlawful? Or is that a sufficient cause for Schism, for remember, that is our point.

Your Condemning private Baptism, as unlawful to a child in danger of Death, is a Vindication of the Preface to the Discourse of Baptism, for which the Author hath been blamed as doing wrong to the Dissenters, in suggesting, that they laid not so much upon Baptism as we do. But this is not our present Subject, and I will not digress. You say, Christ did not appoint Baptism from the *Jewish* custom. He certainly continued the custom which they had begun, and if the custom had been sinful, and abominable as you say, it is not to be imagined that he would have given that countenance to it, instead of Reproving it.

You say, Things of a civil nature, common to others, as well as Christians, to other actions, as well as Religious, (as Love Feasts, Kiss of Charity,) may be done without Divine Appointment, our Anti-Ceremonial men grant to all the World

Hands, &c. No, in vain do ye worship me. In Tything, Minr, we deny not the Magistrates power in Tything, Ministers maintenance is a civil thing, observe a great contradiction of yours now. Mans Law, said to be Gods Law, Christ respected them. Whereas you tell me so often of *Schism*, I have desired you to tell me what *Church* it is I am a *Schismatick* from. Is it the *Rebellious, Perjur'd, King-Dethroning, Church of England*, as some call her? Or the *seditionous Conventicles* of Popishly affected *Jacobites* that others talk of, till then, I am not bound to say more of *Schism*. I thought according to some, nothing could warrant taking up Arms against a King, and then according to you, nothing could warrant a Separation (which you always call *Schism*) from a *Church*. There is no cause for *Schism* in the *Church*, (say you,) that is not as sufficient for *Rebellion* in the *State*. Is not your *Church*, then, think you, a *Schismatical Church* from the *Mother Church of Rome*? That the *Church Wardens Oath* is enjoyned (as you say) by Law is denied. The *Bishop of Bristol* 20 Years since, was cast here. (*Carleton*.) The refusers of that Oath have been *Excommunicated*, and required to get others to serve in their place, which is unlawful, for Reasons given in my last to you. 5 Gal. 1. I will not say your Answer, or Argument was anticipated before you wrote it, lest it should displease, sure you cannot think I thought
when

when Paul says, *Be ye not the Servants of Men?* Men should not serve their Masters. You tell me not what is your sound Sense of the words, nor the Reasons why you take not my Sense to be so. God left men 14 *Rom.* to their liberty, and no man can deny it them. The Magistrate is forbidden imposing unnecessary things on the weak. *Receive ye him,* saith Paul, *Reject him,* saith your Church. 7 ver. *No man liveth to himself.* 10, *Who art thou that setteest at naught thy brother.* 22. *Hast thou faith, have it to thy self before God,* Chap. We that are strong ought to bear with the infirmities of the weak, Yes, say some, if the Magistrate doth not forbid it. O Paul, (or rather O Jesus,) thou shalt be Obeyed, unless our Church commands us otherwise. Who regards these Precepts yet they scrupled things lawful, we unlawful. 5 *Col.* 14. 10, 11, 12, 16. Read, and you will read your fallacy. *A bene conjunctis mala diviso.* Mens Sins, and old Ceremonies, were both nailed to Christ's Cross.

Did I make every thing I wrote of a sufficient cause for Schism, especially simply by it self, that this is so often all the answer I can get, *This is no cause for Schism?* Are they all Non-conformists, as you say, That examine not Communicants? Then I think, they are all Non-Conformists now from the greatest to the least. VVell, I see the Noncons have gotten company, more than a good many

ny, by what names or titles soever they are dignified, or distinguished, whether the most Reverend, the Arch-Bishops, the right Reverend the Bishops, or all inferior Priests and D — — —.

I am glad you profess your self to be no *Arminian*, and grant such Subscribers to the 39 Articles, and Book of Homilies, Noncons, (and I say perfidious ones) you ask me, where heard I — — I answer, The last Sermon I ever heard in the Church of England save one, about 2 years since; Three Articles were Preacht against by no mean Man, and I would prove upon him what you say, that he was a *Non-conformist*, and ought to be Excommunicated for that Sermon.

What I wrote against Private Baptism, confirms not the charge, because I told you, the practise of other *Noncons* contrary to mine; and I doubt not many Church Men are of my mind in this thing, not yours. Because I only object, where such a Baptism may hasten a child's death. And can you, or will you say otherwise? You say the same of Jewish Baptisms which you long since did, and take no notice of my reply, therefore I am not bound to take notice any more of that Subject. For Killing and Feasting, I take them not as Religious Acts, if you do prove them so; only all things we do, must tend to the Glory of God in eating and drinking, and whatever we do.

I remember not that in my Last, I wrote any thing of Musick, if I did, then what you say of it was pertinent to the occasion.

In short, I think the Old Church of England is gone out of sight, for Doctrine, Discipline and Manners. You know it was a great Question in the Schools at Athens; whether, when all the Old Planks were gone out of *Theseus* his ship (one gone after another) it might still be said, here is *Theseus* his ship: I know not how far they were agreed. If it please you to give me your Opinion about this, we may be the sooner agreed here. This present Church, which some Jacobites call a Schismatical Church, her Priests *Jeroboams* Priests, such as are not to be Communicated with at the Lords Table, hath been a Factor for Rome, a full of Perjuries, Perfidious Baptisms, broken Prayers, Foolish sinful Ceremonies, she is bloody in her Principles (and once practice too) and therefore I think separation from her is no Schism, but a Duty.

To the Buxterians

Brethren,

W Herber you have not very much contri-
 buted to the growth of Crispianism, is
 humbly offered to your consideration, as
 they by their foolish, unsound Oppositi-
 ons of you, have added to your number. As
 not one false Charge, (no nor mistake) was
 ever proved on me in my Vindix, so I
 hope, will no such thing, (or can no such
 thing) be proved on me in this Book. I
 was so valued your Master, that I had
 his Picture in my Bed-Chamber, and for
 a considerable time after I awake in the
 Morning, lookt on it with delight. — I ne-
 ver doubted then, nor since, but that he de-
 served the name of a great Man, who
 think, he knew too many things to know any
 thing well, or at other greater Men than
 he a. d. He had (I think,) been a wiser
 Man, had he not had so much Wits. I am
 glad, that notwithstanding your Masters
 Dectin of Non Resistance, nothing is far-
 ther from Jacobitism, than you; and that
 His Most Sacred Majesty hath not more
 loyal Subjects in the three Kingdoms than
 you are; and that your Meetings are va-
 lued by you, and your People not told of
 receiving the Sacrament from Parsons
 given to Cursing and Swearing. I know
 some of you are not pleas'd that I thus A-
 pologize for the Independents. I have
 often

often observed, that some Conformist who will not call you Schismatics, call the Independents so. And Mr. Baxter o'ten called them so, and Fanaticks too in his Life, written by his own Hand. And why, because they complied not with (I think,) some of the most Fanatical Worship under Heaven.

I confess, I have sinned in my once Compliance, tho ignorantly, not against Light. The last Plot convinced me of this, I will be so civil to our Clergy, as to conceal my Reasons. The Men I now contend with, are a giddy Generation, they that think God loved them with a Complacential Love in their unregeneracy, when Drunkards and Whoremongers, Lyars and Oppressors, some of them may think God may so love them still, if they run on in their Sins, and so delight in them in Heaven too. Alas! alas! miserable Souls are they, who take as if sadness for Sin were one of their greatest Sins, and all doubts to be unbelieved. No Fasting, or Prayers can do good, they must act from life, (which you deny not,) not for life, say they, which must not be granted. Let them Read that little Book of Martyrs, Heb. 10, who looked for a city, whose builder and maker is God who had an Eye to the Recompence of Reward, and lest this should be accounted weakness: 12 Heb. 1. 2. The Apostle direct to the same, Looking to Jesus, who for the joy that was set before him endured the cross. Are they more perfect, greater self-deniers than Christ?

Yet Brethren let me speak freely to you, Do not call all Crispians, or Antinamians, that have provoked you; do as Jehu did, when he gave charge against the worshippers of Baal, See there be none of the Servants of the Lord, but the worshippers of Baal only.

Mr. Mather, in a kind Letter to me, disown'd Crispianism, and said, The last Lords Day I Preacht against it. And know no Vindicator of him, but Mr. Cockin I heard the Reverend, Mr. Cole. (now with God,) condemn'd justification from Eternity, at Pinners Hall. Yet those were too great favourers of Mr. Allen, more than their Brethren. Dr. Chauncy seeks to qualifie bad passages in Dr. Crisp, as you do passages not good in another. But I am well assured, he is no more a thorow Crispian, than Mr. Williams is a thorow Baxterian, neither have spoken half so bad as their Masters. Love blinds the Judgment in defending, or censuring, both these are good Men, and I hope they so judge one of another. The man whom I have singled out, is accounted by wise men that know him, to be an ignorant, intolerable, Heretick. He that will not take Christ in all his Offices shall know him in none. Talk of Christ the Priest a thousand times over, all is in vain, without Christ the King. They that condemn sorrow, for Sin shall sit down in sorrow.

You seem to me to have an advantage against them that refused (as you say Faithful Rebukes, &c.) to subscribe to the Anticrispian

the Crispian Propositions sent to them.

No wonder such as I plead against, are so free to lie, when they believe the Sins were pardoned before they were committed, or they were born, from the Days of Eternity; that Sin can do them no hurt; that they are not the Sinners, that to go to Humiliation, &c. is nothing. Are these fit to talk of Gospel Preachers, who shall say of the Linnen-Draper Speaker, what if he tript, he wrote only the Heads, and some Sentences.— And yet at another time, says If any print his Sermon, he will do it, for he wrote all. And indeed was both seen by the same persons? What faces of brass have such, noted for nothing, but the two good qualifications, ignorance, and impudence. It is beneath a wise Man to throw away his anger upon them.

I pray you, (as before,) conclude not that all that plead for Dr. Crisp, are no friends to Good Works, or a Holy Life, some of them say, they are sorry Dr. Crisp said, Paul personated a scrupulous man, when he said, O wretched man that I am, who shall deliver me from the body of Death? That say, they disown what he said. Whoever hath any sadness for Sin, is out of Christ the way, &c. Tho they take pains (not a little) to prove Dr. Crisp in other places, mean not so and so. The common practise of all Bigots for their Sect Masters.

I know to your immortal Honour, you generally are no Friends to ignorant Trades Men Preaching.

Yet We are told every where, our Linnen-
Draper was countenanced by Mr. How.

1. Mr. How is a Gentleman, and a
Courtier, and such great Persons are not
understood easily, always, and by all men
especially by ignorant Persons.

2. This talk of encouragement was be-
fore the Young Spark prophand a Pulpit,
Mr. How knew him not, and might be
imposed on.

3. I am informed by no mean Man, Mr.
How denies it; and so much for that great
or greatest Plea for our profound Doctor.

Are the French Churches laden more
or less with good works, since they were so
corrupted by Camero, Tilenus, and others,
to put works out of their right place in a
wrong one? Geneva corrupted to your Joy,
exceeding Joy, but to our sorrow, exceed-
ing sorrow, may in time this way lose its
beauty and comeliness. Tho some worthy
men among you, own Christ righteousness
is not imputed to us for our Justification
in the Effect only — Yet others of
them censure these Men. What hath

Mr. Humphreys done to name no more!
who talkt against Mr. VVilliams (that
Semi-Baxterian,) like some little Crispian?

We call for your help against these com-
mon Enemies; I need not say much here,
but close this as the Poet his Tristia,

Qui monet, ut facias, quod tu facis, ille monendo,
Laudat, et, hortatu comprobat acta suo.

The

A *SPEECH*, deliver'd at *Turner's-Hall*, April 29. at a Meeting, with the Consent of the Lord-Bishop and Lord Mayor, where Mr. Keith (and I also) desired Mr. Penn to appear, to answer to our Charge, where were present one of the Sheriffs (and one of the Marshalls, to keep the Peace) and also several Ministers and Gentlemen, and others, of all Perswasions. By *T. M.*

*H*aving written a Book, intitled, William Penn and the Quakers either Impostors, or Apostates, which they please, proved from their avowed Principles, and contrary Practices; and also a Censure of George Fox his Journal, and other Quakerish Writers, I shall decline needless Revisions. The last time I appeared here, on the like Occasion as now, I laid this as my Foundation, That God is a God of Truth, That the Spirit is a Spirit of Truth, that the Devil is the Father of Lyes, that therefore George Fox was, William Penn is, and other Quakers are, Impostors, and False Prophets, teaching false and contrary Doctrines and prophecying Lyes, things that never were, or came to pass. I charged

George

George Fox, among other things, with this
 story, That he saw the Blood of Martyrs
 in the Streets of Litchfield, and waded
 thro' their Blood. William Fox, for de-
 claring, as sure as the Lord liveth, Tho-
 mas Hicks should not go to the Graven in
 Peace &c. Solomon Eccles. with Pro-
 phesying in the name of the Lord to John
 Story, That he should dye that year,
 because he had set himself against George
 Fox, the Apostle of Jesus Christ, ore-
 waded thro' your Tears, after I shall
 be acquainted you with Objections I have
 met with from sober Quakers, and others;
 and it being so late, I hope not to detain
 you half an Hour.

Objection. Many things they Pro-
 phesied, as it came to pass. Answer. It
 is enough That many things also did not,
 that if I should now declare in the name
 of the Lord, That Man shall Dye this
 Year, and that man also? What if one of
 them dye, will that prove me a true Pro-
 phet? No, the continued Life of the other
 will prove me a false one. What I
 should say, Thus saith the Lord, To mor-
 row there shall be Rain, but the next
 day none? If there be Rain to morrow, I
 am no true Prophet if it Rain also the Day
 after. Many things, Muggleton said,
 came to pass; but all what the Prophets of
 the Lord said, did so.

Object. Did not the Prophet prophecy
 falsely, when he brought back the other
 Prophet to Eat and Drink at his own
 house, in the Reign of Jeroboam.

The Messenger is a Prophet of the Ever-
lasting, and shall be a Temptation
well as other men; but he is called
false Prophecy, &c. Yet what he
and how far, a Prophet dwelling in that
distant place, I shall not determine.

Object. George Fox meant he was
called a Visionary, and when Edward
Barrington said, God could soon Ar-
rangoise of the Saints to destroy the
Wicked; but for the present, it must be
thus, &c. he is to be understood Spiritually,
and that Friends were to blame in Print-
ing it as they did.

Then it follows, George Fox, in
writing that Book, and W. Pen in
Publishing it for them, did not intend it
should be understood Visionary; neither
will the words bear it. He put on
Shoes, he ran thro the streets of Ld-
field, and cried, Wo to the bloody
City, &c. These things were not Visionary.
Hundreds saw him; neither, therefore
could his wading thro their Blood be the
warming of his Feet. — Were not the
Saints to bave their spiritual Arms on for
the present, according to E. B.?

4. Object. If all this be true, G. Fox,
W. Pen, and others, were Deceivers.
What is this to the Principle? their
Opinions may be right?

1. This will go far. 2. W. Pen goes
over to them, will pretend to be Inspired,
and Infallible. How can they then joy with
them, proved to be Imposters, and false
Prophets? These Men, surely, will play

their Infallibilitys and Inspirations lustily
one upon another. 3. These Men have
been even Adored, by the Spirit of Dis-
torting too. — Glory be to thee — Let
me feel thy Vertue. 4. Their Letters
have been the Quakers Directories, their
Dictates, the Quakers Oracles. 5. Spi-
ritual Courts were set up by these Men
from the Lord. 6. Can any of them say
they were convinced, Baptism and the Supper
were nothing, An Oath was unlawful, by
their Inward Light, and not by Fox, their
Outward Light?

Before I go any further, I must remove
a Difficuly that lies in my way. Crocker
a Dutch Divine, hath written a large Book
of five Shillings price, called, The Histo-
ry of the Quakers; much in favour of
them. But I do declare, it is a vile, false
History; but to do him right, he confesseth,
he had his Accounts from the Quakers
Writings lent to him. Therefore he was
scredulous, he tells us of G. Fox's Fasting
ten Days, &c. It is well known in Am-
sterdam long since, a Woman pretended she
should fast longer than Christ, fifty Days,
a great Concourse, all wonder at this Mi-
racle; the Lords at last, caused the place
to be narrowly searcht, and under the
Chair was a Trap Door, where was all
Necessaries for Life. They Strangled her,
and as I hear, her Statue was made in
Wax in the same Chair, representing the
Cheat, yet to be seen in the same Cloaths.
I doubt not, if G. Fox kept a ten Days
Fast, it was such a Fast as the Amster-
dam

dam Gentlewoman. Croese also tells us
 what Barbarities were used to the Quakers
 (not fit to be named) in Bristol, in the
 last Persecution in their Meetings, which
 I then, a Bristol Man, never heard any
 word of; and how the Quakers persevered
 to the last, when I affirm for years they
 left their Publick Meeting place as one
 Man. This false Historian tells us,
 That in New-England the Quakers were
 so cruelly whipt, that many swooned in
 the Streets to see it, and that the Whip was
 such, That the Executioner was forced
 to put both Hands to hold it. I
 doubt not but Friends are made to believe,
 that the whipping of Dr. Oats was not
 worse, (or as bad) as theirs. He says
 little of these Mens Blasphemies about Scrip-
 ture, and the man Christ Jesus, &c. It is
 well known the last time I thus appeared in
 this place, a Quaker to divert me from my
 Charge against Pen, and other Impostors,
 and false Prophets, said, Did not the Pres-
 byterians Persecute in New-England?
 What sayst thou G. Keith, dost thou not
 know it? But might not I have return'd,
 did not the Quakers Persecute in Pensilvan-
 nia? What say you Mr. Keith, Do you
 not know it? Yes surely, he knew it too
 well, and felt it to purpose; for they so Per-
 secuted him, that had not the King sent
 a new Governour there, when Mr. Pen
 absconded as a Jacobite, we had not had
 him now within, but the Quakers, in his
 Grave long since. To this Croese is forced
 to acknowledge against them (among other
 things)

things) there, That George Fox put his name to a Book sent to John, the III. King of Poland, for Toleration; full of excellent Latin, Greek, and French Sentences out of Learned Writers, as if He had been acquainted with those Authors. This Book was so curious, it was Translated into many Languages, and call'd Fox's Book. When it is notorious he never well understood his Mother Tongue. Grose says out against this pride of Fox: A horrible Cheat say I. I my self, Sirs, have long since read Historier bearing Fox's name, which I with others then thought to be his, but he sent, as I am well informed, to the two Lyd's in Wales, and other Schoolers, to make such Books, and he would put his Name to them. He also says, That the story of one Brown, that Fox says had Vision and Revelation, concerning him what he should do. Was only the Author's Opinion, about him, when dying. And that it was Customary with Fox to write down such Stories & Prophecies from the Lord, &c. That Fox also called many Women on his Spirit of Discerning, Witches, and Sorceresses, of which no proof could be found; for such things was he beaten by many in the Streets. — No wonder. Having cautioned you against this Book, I proceed concerning VVilliam Pen, that he was a false Prophet hath been proved, and more proof we have of his not being Inspired and Infallible; that he shuffled in the last Persecution is well known. A Quaker who valued him, told me, that when a

Constable came to him in the Adjoining
lay hold on him, and said, I doubt, Sir,
you have been the Speaker (which was
true,) Mr. Pen pointed to one else of,
(who had also spoken,) That is he. Whilst
the Constable went to him, Mr. Pen ran
away out at a Back Door, This Quaker
said, He could hardly believe his own
Bare of Eyes; and could not Sleep quiet-
ly several Nights after, that such a pre-
sious Speaker as Friend William was, would
so speak and do. Contrary Doctrines have
been delivered from one and the same Infal-
lible Spirit. In one Book against the Con-
formists, he says, Tell the Church, &c.
The Church was not to be Judge of mat-
ters of Conscience. In another Book for
his own Cause, against the Separatists, he
says, It was: For the late Liberty
granted them by Authority, it is now declar-
ed, Scripture is an exact Rule of Faith
and Obedience. And now the external
Form of an Oath with us, is abated then
they swallow down such Words in the Pre-
sence of God, &c. which have from the
Spirit been denyed to be lawful, especially
about Meum and Tuum. I cannot believe
the story Mr. Pentell of his Father, that
he should say to him on his Death-Bed,
Son, if you continue in your plain, sim-
ple way of Living, you will put an end
to all Preachers to the end of the World.
It is likely so brave and worthy a Gentle-
man as his Father was, should thus ex-
press himself, for my part, I cannot believe
on Mr. Pen's Testimony, however, if it is

me, I shall only say this, The Father was such a Prophet, as is the Son. I now leave him, and go to one of their greatest Men, (too least censured by us,) Robert Barclay the Scotch-man, his Theol. ver. Christ. Apol. in that Book, is false History, unground Divinity, coarse Latine.

In his Preface to King Charles, II. he thus says of the Quakers, Non in Angulis aut obscura loca irrepentes, aut lemet abscondentes, sicut omnes alii professores Dissidentientes fecerunt. — In nullis privati Conventiculis aut Secretis locis, &c. That they bore their Testimony always openly, and none but they, that by this were they known to be the People of God, &c. The last time I bore appeared, a Bristol Friend was brought forth to Testify against me, before all the People. That Bristol Friends never left their Publick Meetings. When I asked him in the Presence of God, whether he was not one of them, that left the Meeting a long time? The Man was in great distress, between Credit and Conscience, at last confest, he had left it Months together. — And slunk away out of this place, that when I turn'd from the People, to speak to him again, he was gone. — Barclay, tells that King, That the Quakers were true to him in his Adversities. — and he did appeal to the King's Conscience concerning their Innocency. — Now if King Charles thought them so, he should appeal to his Ignorance, not Conscience; For we here all know, Fox, and others, call'd of-

son on Oliver Cromwel, to strengthen his Forces against the Kings Return. And in the name of the Lord justified what was done to the Family, and the Malignants; and said C. Love was seduced by a bad Spirit to seek to bring him in; Andrew & the Presbyterians as Apostles for attempting it. — Now Oh how faithful they were always to him, and how Generations to come, would tell what great things God had done for him! In the Book he says of all Persecutions, Provehunt a Spiritu Cain, et veritate contraria. Well, then in Pennsylvania, Cain would have slain G. Keith, their Bomber Abel. Tho this Barclay be accounted by some among us, better than others among them, it may be a mistake. He calls our Praying and Preaching, Idolatrous Idolatry. — He was indeed sincere in making the Book, in deciding his greater Controversies between us, and them, and insisting on the Fall, Justification by Works, Perfection, and other things, more Popish, Sociniana, and other Authors, had stocked him with Arguments.

Some perhaps may wonder I have said nothing all this while of George Whitehead. The true reason is, I take him to be such a Fool, that he is not worth Observation. I heard him once Expound in Bristol Meeting Solomon's Fool not only to be a Holy, but Sinless man too, as I have Printed. I hope others are convinced so now, that have read his late Antidote.

to that prodigious piece of Sense, called
The Snake in the Grass. To all the ma-
ny Charges that Author brings out of their
Masters, how they had flattered Oliver
Cromwel, contrary to what they had
said to King Charles, and all in the name
of the Lord. He only says in short, This
Charge is foul and false. How false?
and not attempt to disprove one of his E-
vidences? No doubt he knew all to be
true. Again, he tells us how others ap-
plied themselves to Oliver. — Did they
say I, do it in the name of the Lord,
pretending to a Spirit of Infallibility and
Inspiration? No. He says also, The Act
of Indemnity forbids mentioning those
things. — True, by way of Reviling
but not in a way of Disputation. Was not
that Act in Force when Pen, and others,
twisted the Dissenters with Garments
roll'd in Blood? I therefore concern not
my self about so weak an Adversary, and
declare I never will.

For that Quaker who Prophesied, Lon-
don should be Burnt within two Days,
when it was so, it is enough to prove him
not a Prophet sent of God, seeing in the
midst of the Flames he so often Prophesied to
the People, The Fire should end here,
and then there, where he would stop, and
the Fire should proceed no further, but the
Fire raged still. Well, it is sufficient for
me to know, Friends never believed their
own Prophets, nor regarded them; there-
fore, I pray them excuse us, that we in
nothing follow their Example.

And Quakers were very few
 at that time

What follows from all that I have said Historically, after another hath spoken Doctrinally?

1. That these Men were not true Prophets, nor sent by the God of truth. Are there any here so weak, that I need say to them, Then were they false Prophets, and sent by the Devil, the Father of Lies?

2. That great was their madness, that the so vile boasted of Perfection, George Fox said, he was Equal with God, as perfect as Christ, &c.

3. That they were miserably deluded, who almost Adored such Men, Glory be to thee George Fox. — Holy One.

I close all with a great and remarkable Story, which it may be none here have known, which I had from a Minister of known Learning, and Piety, whose worthy Friend told him, he had it from the Minister to whom the doleful Subject of the Story belonged. A Gentleman in Oliver's Days passing by a Church-Yard, where was a great Concourse of People, and a Fryar, whom he knew in Spain, preaching to them when the Fryar had ended, this Gentleman came to him, and desired to Drink with him a Glass of Wine at the next Tavern. Away Man, said the Fryar, with those unfruitful words of Darkness. Pray, Sir, Replied, Do not thus Cant with me, for I know you, and at Madrid, you and I had a Disputation about such a Question, else I will discover you, upon which the Fryar promised to go with him to a place appointed,

This is the story of the
 death of George Fox

then said the Fryar, I saved you from the Inquisition, when I could have sent you there. I pray give me no trouble, as I gave you none. He promis'd he would not, if he would faithfully answer him a few Questions, which the Fryar promis'd him. The Gentleman askt him, *What he did there?* He answered, The Nation is now in a Ferment about Religion, and we always serve our own turns on such occasions; and if you please, I will make you to do as the Quakers, one Day, and afterwards, you shall be as now you are; the Gentleman contented, (perhaps doubting the thing,) the Fryar after some tricks, put the Gentleman in a raving Fit; out he runs in the Streets, crying, *Repent, Repent, &c.* At the time appointed the Gentleman came to himself, and perceiv'd he had in that Fit a strange extension of all his Nerves, &c. and his Fancy strangely mis'd: but on the Review of his thus tempting of God, and Blaspheming his Name, he pined away a long time, and Dyed. I know his Name, and the place where he dwelt.

If it be thought hard that I once compar'd Fox's *Lying* *Wonders* with those of Father *Cress*, I do declare, I believe from my Conscience, *Cress* to be much the Honester Man. He may be blamed for his Credulity, for he pretends not, he saw (much less wrought,) the Miracles he

he mentions, as this Deceiver did. He says That Christ appeared to St. Denys, and told him in a Dream, he had Dedicated a Church in *Glassebury* to his Mother, in his own Person long since, and that having thus said, he pierced his Finger through the Bishop's Hand, and told him, that the next Day in reciting the Canon of the *Mass*, *per ipsum*, &c. his hand should be made whole, many saw the wound the next Day. And as luck would have it, at the Reciting those words in the *Mass*, the Bishop was healed. Protestants he says, are not willing to believe this Antiquity of the *Mass*, or that our Lord dignified it by mentioning it, and working a miracle at the Celebration. *Cre. 1. 1. 1. of Br. pag. 26. chap. 7.* But Friend George tells you of a Miracle worth a Thousand of these. He waded through the Blood of a Thousand Martyrs, laid in *Dioclesian's* time, was led through the Flaming Sword, &c. The Virtues and Operations of the Creatures were open to him. O depth, &c.

When George Fox, said, He fasted 40 Days, all may wonder, but I, that know the Quakers Juggles, Fallacies, and Equivocations, can tell you how many ways Friends can get him off.

1. He did not say he fasted the ten Nights also, George might Eat and Drink, and he poor *Shove-miller* smooth his Paunch after this self-denial; it is well known the *Turks* have such Fasts.

2. George

blow, and did not say he fasted ten Days successively one after another. Now George might fast one Day at one time, a month after another, when perhaps he could not get Bread by making Shoes; for I have reason to believe he never made one good pair in his Life, and that no Man of reputation would employ him.

3. Friend George did not say he fasted the whole Day. But it may be, he fasted till Dinner, and then began his new Fast till Supper.

4. George might mean no pleasant Meat came into his mouth, as Daniel's did, thus to fast.

But the Quakers, tho' so apparently wise, and pious, are always boasting of their Holiness. Mr. Per tells us, No words of mine can get out of Men's minds the Notions of the Quakers' Holiness. For my part, I profess no words of his can get out of my mind the Notions of his, and their Unholiness; Lying, and Hypocrisy. This mighty man of theirs when in Discourse, he knew the Charge of his Adversary true, as that he wrote, *The Imputed Righteousness was the Doctrine of Devils*. There gave a Cant for an Answer. *Oh if thou felt these things.*

Mr. Bagg hath lately made a good Proposal, That our *Sermons* would call for him, and the chief of them, and demand which Confession, or Declaration they own, either the late Dissembling one to them, or their former contrary Blasphemies. If they say their last, let them

there renounce those. But this would
 make void Inspiration, and Infallibility
 I desire you, Reader, to take notice this
 man *Mr. Bagg*, hath Corrected gross
 and foul mistakes of that false Historian,
Croesus Hist. of Quak.

If some think, I have been too severe
 upon *G. Blackhead*, I pray consider, that
 speaking from those words, *9. Job 20.*
 which I have proved to militate against
 their Doctrine of Perfection. He reads,
I would know my own Soul, and tells *How*
perfect men should endeavour to know their
own Soul, when nothing is so, and the
 sense quite otherwise.

I acknowledge *Fisher, Barclay*, and
Mr. Pen, and others, *Adversaries* worth
 Coping with, but not such Fellows as
 this *G. Blackhead* once Printed the
 story of *Exeter Bapts. d. Blood*, half
 a year after *Parker*, the first Publisher
 had recanted it as a Fable, at the com-
 mand of *K. C. the 2.* Yet this vile man,
 when told by *Dr. R.* and others, who
 came to his House about it, to desire him
 in his next Book to correct his mistake,
 he said, *He would not, bid them begon, or*
he would use violence, &c.

Mr. Pen's quibbling is intolerable
 the Scriptures are not the word of God but
 the word of the word. *Quakerism* a new
 nick Name for old Christianity. It is he
 said, that in my last, I declared, I inten-
 ded to trouble my self with this Cause
 no more.

1. It was but an Intention, not pro-
 mise.

2. Now

or 2. New Occurrences (and I assure you
 unexpected ones) have since befallen me,
 which makes my Apology for me. The
 Story is this, A Quaker of Note (espe-
 cially for Ignorance,) and Mr. Penn's In-
 timate sets upon me in the Coffee-
 House; *That I was a Liar and a Slan-
 derer, to say Mr. Penn said Christ was
 born in Nazareth; That he would pay me
 Five Shillings if I could prove it the next
 day before many and competent Witnesses.*
 The Book was produced, the Thing
 proved, and the Money paid soon after,
 he published every where, and at it
 to me. That a Church Friend of theirs
 (was it he that wrote against Mr. Keith
 and me?) vowed he would break my
 Head. About ten Days after this, when
 I came from Mr. Keith's at Nine of the
 Clock in the Evening (then dark) as
 soon as I came to Moore-Fields, a Man
 sets upon me, strook me to the Ground,
 look'd on me a long time as one con-
 sidering what to do. I expected in that
 misery no other but that he would
 draw his Sword, and run me through;
 but he took a great Stone, and flung it
 my Head; down ran the Blood on all
 my Cloaths, in that case was I found,
 and lead home. I desired Mr. Penn to
 examine the Matter before Friends of his
 and mine. He refused, I then entreat-
 ed him, not to put it in his Journal,
*That a Prophet came to me from the Lord
 to tell me my Head should be broken, and
 that it came to pass ten Days after. Such*
 Tricks

Thicks have been sometimes among the Perfect Ones. I doubt not but that this is sent far and nigh as a Confirmation of their Faith. Whether it be true what a Gentleman, lately coming to the City, says, who offer'd to prove it before Mr. Penn, That often from Month to Month he sent Letters to Rome, I will not say. But his declining to meet him, and their new Fears, who would not suspect till now looks suspicious. Croesus confess he was at Paris, and often at the French Court before he turned Quaker.

I lately saw an Admonition to the Quakers of Philadelphia in Pensilvania, to other Quakers ~~where~~ where he says ~~where~~ and other Abominations were grown common among them, &c. The Story he tells of Jennings his Knavery is notorious; what says Sir William to all this? Now a Prophet is come from the Lord to the Quakers, to tell them they should ~~not~~ ~~be~~ as in ~~him~~ or Discourse, for the Lord will soon take the Controversy in his own Hand, and appear against Geo. Keith in particular. What! is he to be knockt down too? He goes now in the Evening with a Guide as I do. ~~101~~ ~~271~~ If any of you would write to me about this, I pray direct as a friend did, to be left in South ~~day~~ street, Friday street, at the House of John Steplehouse (Church,) over against the sign of the Great Lion (the Sun) But Friends about Doctrine write me nothing, for I know you have our Faith to your selves, another for us. And

And because many of the Quakers are Socinians to my Knowledge, and the Socinians their Friends, I will say something on that Argument. Mr. Penn once brought Insocinianism among them. If Christ was only a Creature, tell me how can the Scripture tell us of the Love of God, in giving Christ more than any other thing? Or, which is more difficult for you to understand, the Love of Christ, in giving himself? The Love of God, in giving Christ? God so loved the World, that he gave his only begotten Son. He that spared not his own Son, shall he not with him freely give us all things? Where he argues from the greater to the lesser. He that will give me a Thousand Pound, will give me Five if occasion be. But if God made a holy Man to preach a holy Law, and lead a holy Example in this more than Paragon, Grace, and Eternal Life? But your greater Difficulty is, how can the Aposle tell us of Length, Depth, Breadth and Height of the Love of Christ that passeth Knowledge (where else is the Love of God so exprest? Philosophy knows but three Dimensions, Longitude, Latitude, and Profundity, but the Love of Christ four. Now on their Notions we may talk of Christ's Love to himself, but not to us, for which of them would not suffer a thousand times more than they imagine Christ did to acquire but the thousandth part of the Glory they say he thus acquired.

quired? Who talks in all Company, Oh the Love of King William to 3 distressed Nations, to come and save us, when he got a Crown by it, tho it is true his Love was great to us. The divine Nature is not common to the Three Persons, as a Genus to a Species for it is indivisible: nor as a Species to Individuals, for it is not multiplied: not as a Town to its Parts, for the God-head hath no Parts. But

Great is the Mystery of Godliness. If it be a Mystery, and not only so, but a great one, and not only so, but the great one of Godliness, God manifest in the Flesh. I am content to look on it as such, therefore Mr. Synesius on that Text, *We shall for ever be with the Lord*; and others speak wisely, That all attempts to strike our Reason about the Hypostatic Union are in vain. Read 6 the whole 12. John 41, 43, 49.

Was that Lord on the Throne whom *Isaiah* saw the true God, or most High God, to whom the flying Seraphims cried, *Holy, Holy, Holy Lord God of Hosts*? Yes sure, John tells you this was Christ, 12 John, thus said *Isaiah*, *When he saw his Glory, and spake of him*, and that he refers to this Chapter here, and no other appears from the Words cited; 40 Verses *Isaiah* saith again, *He hath blinded their Eyes, and hardened their Hearts*. For in *Isaiah* 43, sure he saw Christ there in his Suffering, not Glory, numbered among Transgressors, in his Stripes:

Stripes; and John says, *Isaiah* said a-
gain, which is elsewhere. 16. Christ's
Suffering was his Glory, as some say let
them consider. O Fools and slow of
Heart to believe all the Prophets have
said. Ought not Christ to suffer these
things, and so to enter into his Glory? Be-
sides, the Words cited 12 John are not in
6 *Isaiah* 53.

Consider once again, 4. *Gal.* 8.
They were charged with once worship-
ping that which by Nature is not God.
If Christ then be to be worshipped, He
is God by Nature. Now the Angels
worship him, if they, much more we;
1. *Heb.* 6. We are commanded to wor-
ship him, *Psal.* 4. Thy Throne, O God,
endureth for ever. For he is thy Lord;
worship thou him, 1. *Heb.* 8, 9. That all
that call on the Name of the Lord Jesus;
1 *Cor.* 1, 2. Saul went to persecute
them that called on the Name of Je-
sus, for so were the Churches known
by this; for Jesus tells *Ananias* what he
should do, and tells *Saul* it was his;
9. *Acts* 14. compared with the 17.

Once more 2. *Rev.* 2 3. All the Churches
shall know I am he which searcheth the
Reins and Hearts.

Is it not God's Privilege to search
Hearts, who knoweth? If the Lord search
the Hearts, and try the Reins, none but he.

Doth Christ know Men's Thoughts,
Principles and Ends at all times, in all
places? Is he indeed with them that are
gathered together in his Name? Is he in
the midst of them? How I pray! A.

Again Psal. 83. 18. *Thou whose Name alone is Jehovah,* now Christ is so called *Jehovah* our *Righteousness*.

For praying to Christ I know the *Socinians* are divided about it. *Socinus* did it, and the *Racovian* *Alcaron* (pardon the Expression) pleads it, it is there said.

Q. *Quid putas de istis, qui nolum adorare Jesum Christum?*

A. *Non sunt Christiani.*

Franciscus Druid (that blasphemer) and his Followers condemned all Adoration, and call their Brethren Idolaters, and I think their Charge is true on their common Principle. To say Christ is indeed a *Dependent* and *Subordinate* God, and therefore a *Relative* and *Subordinate* Worship is due to him, That the Father is the *Supreme Cause*, first *Efficient* and last *End*, but Christ is the *middle*, or *second Cause* of Salvation, and *intermediate End* of Religion. What signifies all this when it is no civil Worship given to him as the People did to *David*, &c. but they call it themselves Divine, not so much as God, is the Popish Shifts for worshipping of Saints, not so much to Christ. No wonder there is so great a distance between *Socinians* and *Christians*. (pardon the Expression, I know what I say, and after no mean Men) when such changing one another is among them. *Ezek* says, Who shall declare his Generation, 153. *Isai*. 8. Who indeed? As some Men expect the great

A. *Who shall declare his Generation* 153. *Isai*. 8. Who indeed?

God should give us, his Vassals an Account of his Will, so your proud Reason demand an account of himself, which you must not know, which you are not capable of knowing.

Was it not a good Providence, the *Anti-trinitarian* Address made to the Parliament four years since, troubled them with this their Controversie and Charge? So it is a great Question, whether the Holy Ghost be the power of God, or as *Beedle* and others say, a Created Angel? If it be the Vertue of God, it is Idolatry to give a Created Angel this Honour. If a created Angel, he is rob'd by others of his honour due to him, being not regarded, as it would be to Christ if he were thus overlookt.

That the Person of Father, Son, and Holy Ghost, *subsist in the Divine Nature*, I thinke is the best way of considering and speaking of the Trinity.

The great Objection is 1 *John* 3. *This is life eternal to know thee the only true God, and Jesus Christ whom thou hast sent.* Compare this and 1 *Cor.* 9. 6. *I only, and Barnabas, &c.* and then read *John* 5. 7. *This is the true God*; then as only excluded, not *Barnabas* that follows, but takes him in; so here the only true God, and Jesus Christ the true God. They that say, the scripture says plainly there is but one God, the Father of all, forget the next word, and *we Lord*.

Now if one God excludes Christ from being God, one Lord excludes the Father from

Good Lord. 1 *Prim.* 3. 6. Where
it is said of Christ, *He only hath immortality*,
excludes not the Father from having
Immortality. The essential Properties
are common to all the Three, but not
Personal. I like the old Anthem well
mentioned by Dr South.

Quid sit Deus, quid processus,
Dei defensione sum professor.

The Master of the Sentence: and the
School Men after him have said much a-
bout it, but to little purpose.

I wonder but *Socinians* are not asham-
ed to tell us, That the Jews, Turks, and
they, worship one God: Well match.
God is Lord of the understanding, as
well as of the Will, and as our Wills must
yield to his Laws, tho' a reluctancy against
them, so our understandings to his De-
clarations, tho' a reluctancy against
them, *Three to be One.* O contradic-
tion in Terms, cry our *Socinians*. I lately
asked one of them, What is that he sees
in the Glass? Is it the same thing with
his Face or another? If the same thing,
then *Three may be One.* For we are sure
we sometimes thus see three distinct faces,
and if another, (as we conclude) what is it,
material or immaterial? Not ma-
terial surely, for what becomes of it
when we turn away. *Corruptio uni-*
If immaterial, how do we see it with
our Eyes? may not we cry, O horrible
contradiction of Terms, see with natural
Eyes immaterial, &c.

Isidore gave the fairest stroak I can

remember of any person who
lives in the Glair, but the Trinity
factory. I am of your mind, but
it is not safe to express the *uncreated*
Person by the name of *God*. The
word *Father*, when taken personally, is
only of the first Person in the Trinity,
when collectively, of all in opposition to
Creatures and so, &c. So is Christ the
everlasting Son.

are not Gods works of Creation, and Providence, unfordable: How much more the Discoveries of himself.

And know some Quakers are not Socinians, they own Christ Divinity, but Sabellians, I know none of them Unitarians.

Since this Book was sent to the Press, I saw *Christianity Unmasked*; done by a famous thorough Calvinist Conformist, which pleases me none at all. He is a man famous for Learning, Piety, and Moderation. If any therefore value no Mr. Williams's Book, because of some *Barbarianisms* in it, let him peruse this, where he proves,

That *Cripp*, tho he pretended to be the greatest admirer of Faith, yet would not allow it its due in Justification. That *Cripp* was one that made the word of God of non-effect — It is faith he, no breach of Charity to say, *He was one of the Mockers and Scoffers of the last times foretold by the Apostles*, p. 59. *Obj.* I have neglected the *Day of Visitation* are brought in a Mockery, If they weep,

the Lord's body, which is the body of Christ, who said
that which is the most misrepresentation of
the Lord's body, which is the body of Christ, who said
that which is the most misrepresentation of

These Graces, as they call them, says
he, on the General Tenders of the Goss-
pel, Christ is yours, and as
good as to say, to God man make you
Sincerity is no Qualification, which may be
found in an enemy of Christ, p. 10. Ker-ville
where Sincerity is denied to be in Saint.
That God is never angry with believers for
committing Sin, or neglect of Duties. This
was serious, and a man could not in
true Zeal but condemn. This Christ En-
deavour to the Church, Exaltation, Mat. That
exalted Christ to the Pinnacle of the
Temple, and he was not and destroyed, p. 11.
This is said he, A Diabolical So-
litical Exposition of Christ, to throw
down all Christianity. He takes notice of
the Disputes, Expressions, and Style to
render, many things incompatible, and he
mentions repetition of the same things, in
the very same Words over, and over, some
or five Sermons, said he contain all the
forty-two. He doubts not but his pro-
phane way of talking of Duties, which
says he, the man affected, hath cooled the
Zeal of a great number to Prayer and o-
ther Duties. He looks on his other Ser-
mons as a kind of Recantation, p. 28.
He proves the D. to be full of contradi-
ctions, &c.

